

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. IV.

APRIL 1900.

No. 2.

Doctrinal Theology.

CHRISTOLOGY.

(Continued.)

In and for the work of redemption, and in the manner and measure requisite for such work, Christ the God-man humiliated himself. The verb, *ταπεινόω*, means to *lower*, to *humble*, the contrary being *ὑψώω*, to *raise*, to *elevate*, to *exalt*.¹⁾ With the reflex pronoun, *ταπεινοῦν* signifies to *humble one's self*, to forego honor or high stations or prerogatives which one might rightfully claim or enjoy. Thus Paul says that he had "abased himself,"²⁾ when he had "preached the gospel of God freely," earning his livelihood with his own hands, and taking what other churches gave him, instead of taking and enjoying what he might have rightfully claimed at the hands of the Corinthians.³⁾ And such was the self-humiliation of Christ, *that, though he was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor*;⁴⁾ that he, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, and being in fashion as a man, he humbled

1) Matt. 23, 12. Luke 14, 11; 18, 14. Phil. 2, 8, 9.

2) ἐμαυτὸν ταπεινῶν, 2 Cor. 11, 7.

3) 2 Cor. 11, 5 ff.

4) 2 Cor. 8, 9.

himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.¹⁾

The subject, *subjectum quod*, of this $\tau\alpha\pi\epsilon\nu\omega\sigma\varsigma$, this self-humiliation, was *Christ Jesus*,²⁾ the one and entire theanthropic person. *Subjectum quo*, however, that nature according to which the God-man humbled himself, was the human nature, the nature according to which he was not simply and essentially God, but $\dot{\varepsilon}\nu\ \mu o\rho\phi\bar{\eta}\ \vartheta e\o\bar{u}$, *in the form of God*,³⁾ the nature according to which he was *made in the likeness of men*,⁴⁾ and *found in fashion as a man*;⁵⁾ the nature according to which he was subsequently *exalted* and *given a name above every name*.⁶⁾ According to this nature only it was possible that the God-man should be humiliated and exalted. For the divine nature as such and in itself is not capable of humiliation or exaltation or any other change of state or condition. According to his divine nature he is from everlasting immutable, saying, *I am the Lord, I change not*,⁷⁾ for in him there is *no variableness, neither shadow of turning*,⁸⁾ no humiliation, but *honor and glory for ever and ever*,⁹⁾ *honor and power everlasting*.¹⁰⁾ And yet it was not the man Christ, independent of the Logos, who humiliated himself; for thus the man Christ never existed; but the indivisible person Jesus Christ, in whom the human nature is always the nature of the Son of God, being in the form of God, $\dot{\varepsilon}\nu\ \mu o\rho\phi\bar{\eta}\ \vartheta e\o\bar{u}\ \delta\pi\acute{a}\rho\chi\omega\bar{u}$, as in personal union united with the divine nature and, by communication, endowed with divine attributes.

Such being the subject of Christ's humiliation, this $\tau\alpha\pi\epsilon\nu\omega\sigma\varsigma$ cannot be conceived as having consisted in the assumption of the human nature by the divine nature. This would imply a logical and a theological impossi-

1) Phil. 2, 6—8.

2) Phil. 2, 5 ff. 2 Cor. 8, 9.

3) Phil. 2, 6.

4) Phil. 2, 7.

5) Phil. 2, 8.

6) Phil. 2, 9. Eph. 1, 20.

7) Mal. 3, 6.

8) James 1, 17.

9) 1 Tim. 1, 17.

10) 1 Tim. 6, 16.

bility, a contradiction in itself or *in apposito*. For this would give us a humiliation of and according to the divine nature, which is a theological impossibility, the assumption of a changeable God, and would necessitate the assumption of a second change of and according to the same immutable nature, the exaltation following the state of humiliation. Again, if the humiliation of Christ had consisted in the assumption of a human nature into personal union with the Logos, then his exaltation must have consisted in an abandonment of the human nature by the divine nature and a dissolution of the personal union, the error of Cerinthus and other Gnostics of old. In this case, the Son of man would not now sit at the right hand of the Father Almighty, from whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead; or the Logos, if still united with the assumed human nature, would still be in a state of humiliation, and the state of exaltation must be eliminated from Christian theology. Again, if the *subjectum quo* of Christ's humiliation is, as it must be, the human nature of Christ, then that humiliation cannot have consisted in the assumption of the human nature by the divine nature; for in this case it could not be conceived as a humiliation at all, but only as an exaltation, an elevation to superior dignity, a humiliation which would be in no sense a humiliation, but its very reverse, and thus the state of humiliation would be simply eliminated from Christology. And, finally, if and since the *subjectum quod* of humiliation was the God-man, the theanthropic person consisting of the divine nature *and* the human nature *in* personal union, the assumption of that human nature *into* that personal union cannot itself and as such have been the humiliation of that subject; or we would have an act before the agent, and a subject which could not be the subject.

What, then, was the self-humiliation of the God-man? St. Paul says, ἐκαντὸν ἐχένωσεν, *he emptied himself*. The verb, to empty, does not necessarily signify the removal of all the

contents, but may stand for the removal of the contents of a certain kind. To empty a lecture-room ordinarily means to drive or draw away the students, not to throw out the furniture and apparatus also, leaving only the bare floor and walls. And when the object is a person, and the word is evidently employed in another than a physical sense, the context must indicate the relation in which *κενοῦν* is to be understood. This light may be derived from the previous or the subsequent context, or from both, as in the present instance. The adversative *ἀλλὰ* points to the previous context, which says that Christ, *being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God.*¹⁾ This is a negative statement, and *ἀλλὰ*, as it frequently does, connects the negative statement with the corresponding statement making the same assertion in a positive form. The negative statement is, that Christ, *ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, while being in the form of God, having in or about him that whereby God is known or seen or manifested as God, οὐχ ἀρπαγμὸν ἤγιστο, he did not hold it to be robbery, τὸ εἶναι Ἰησοῦ θεῷ, to be in like manner as God.* Then follows the positive statement, *ἀλλ᾽ ἔαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν, μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, but himself did he deplete, μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, taking upon him the form of a servant, etc.* Christ was God, endowed, also, by communication, in his human nature, with the divine attributes whereby God manifests himself as God, and he might, at all times, have deported himself as God in his majesty. But while a robber decks himself with his plunder and gorges himself with his pillage and makes his captives subservient to his various desires, Christ, on the contrary, practiced self-denial even in regard to what he might have rightfully used and enjoyed. When he might have deported himself as the Lord of lords, he took upon himself the humble form of a servant. Being rich he took upon himself poverty. Being the King of glory, he took upon himself shame and

1) Phil. 2, 6.

ignominy. Being given all power in heaven and in earth, he took upon himself weakness. Being the Prince of life, he took upon himself death, even the death of the cross. Being *ἰητὸς θεῶν*, existing in the manner of God, he, *being also made in the likeness of men, was found in fashion as a man,*¹⁾ with human, though not sinful, weaknesses and frailties. This was his *ὑπόστασις*, and thus did he, the Lord, humble himself in obedience unto death.

And such is the humiliated Christ, not only of St. Paul, but also of the Gospels. When he was in his mother's womb, the Virgin was the mother of the Lord.²⁾ And yet the abode of him who might have shown forth his glory in an ocean of celestial light was the dark matrix of a poor and sinful maiden. Thus was the Word, whose glory was the glory of the only begotten of the Father,³⁾ made flesh, made of a woman,⁴⁾ of the seed of David.⁵⁾ Not inasmuch as it was the assumption of a human nature by the Son of God, but in so far as by the manner in which the incarnation of the Logos took place the God-man *made himself of no reputation*⁶⁾ as the divine Lord in majesty, was Christ's conception and gestation the beginning of his humiliation. When Mary's son was born at Bethlehem, he was Christ the Lord,⁷⁾ Immanuel,⁸⁾ the Mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of peace,⁹⁾ the Son of God.¹⁰⁾ Yet he whom the multitude of the heavenly host adored and who even then ruled the universe, made himself of no reputation, but suffered himself to be wrapt in swaddling clothes and cradled in a manger, there being for him no room in the inn of Bethlehem Ephrata,¹¹⁾ little among the thousands of Judah.¹²⁾ Thus did he then and there humble himself, the Lord taking upon himself the form of a servant. The rite of circumcision had

1) Phil. 2, 7, 8.

2) Luke 1, 43.

3) John 1, 14.

4) Gal. 4, 4. John 1, 14.

5) Rom. 1, 3.

6) Phil. 2, 7.

7) Luke 2, 11.

8) Matt. 1, 22—25. Is. 7, 14.

9) Is. 9, 6.

10) Luke 1, 35. Gal. 4, 4.

11) Luke 2, 7.

12) Micah 5, 2. Matt. 2, 1, 4—6.

been imposed by law upon Abraham and his male progeny, a sinful race conceived in sin. Yet God's holy child,¹⁾ τὸ ἄγνον born of the Virgin,²⁾ the Holy One of God,³⁾ being made under the law,⁴⁾ submitted his holy body to the bloody and painful procedure, in fashion as a helpless babe. When Herod sought the young child to destroy him,⁵⁾ the twelve legions of angels whom Jesus might have asked of his Father to repel the armed gang at Gethsemane⁶⁾ would have answered the summons of him whom the Magi had worshiped, to frustrate Herod's designs. But under a weak foster-father's feeble protection and care he fled into Egypt and remained in exile until impotent Herod was dead.⁷⁾ The Son of man, who, when in the temple of the Lord, was in his Father's house,⁸⁾ and while with Nicodemus on earth was also in heaven,⁹⁾ was known as the carpenter's son of Nazareth,¹⁰⁾ where he had lived in obedience and subjection to his humble parents, increasing in wisdom as in stature.¹¹⁾ He who fed the thousands by the lakeside¹²⁾ suffered hunger in the desert¹³⁾ and thirst on the cross.¹⁴⁾ It was the Lord of glory who was crucified;¹⁵⁾ the Prince of life was killed;¹⁶⁾ having the power to retain his life, he laid it down of himself according to the commandment he had received of his Father,¹⁷⁾ in obedience to the Father's will.¹⁸⁾ And, lastly, the body of the Holy One of God was laid low in another man's grave,¹⁹⁾ reviled and made of no repute even in his sepulchre.²⁰⁾ Thus from the cradle to the grave, in life and in death, he humbled himself.

1) Acts 4, 27. 30.	2) Luke 1, 35.	3) Mark 1, 24. Luke 4, 34.
4) Gal. 4, 4.	5) Matt. 2, 13.	6) Matt. 26, 53.
7) Matt. 2, 14—19.		8) Luke 2, 49. John 2, 16.
9) John 3, 13.		10) Matt. 13, 55. Mark 6, 3.
11) Luke 2, 51. 52.		
12) Matt. 14, 17 ff. Luke 9, 12 ff.	Mark 6, 35 ff.	
13) Matt. 4, 2 ff. Luke 4, 2 ff.		14) John 19, 28.
15) 1 Cor. 2, 8.		16) Acts 3, 15.
17) John 10, 18; 14, 31.		18) Matt. 26, 39. 42.
19) Matt. 27, 58 ff. John 19, 38 ff.		20) Matt. 27, 64—66.

And all this was truly and really *κένωσις*, not *χρύψις*. Christ, in his state of humiliation, did not only appear poor and feeble and suffering and in agony. He did not only appear under temptation, but *was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin*,¹⁾ when he, according to the Father's will and led by the Spirit,²⁾ suffered being tempted.³⁾ His suffering was real suffering of body⁴⁾ and soul,⁵⁾ so that in his weakness and agony he was strengthened by a created spirit,⁶⁾ and cried out, "*I thirst,*" and, "*My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?*"⁷⁾ The rending asunder of his body and soul was not without the *pains of death*.⁸⁾

But on the other hand, this *κένωσις* was not *κτήσεως*, but *χρήσεως*. What Christ did willingly and obediently forego was not the possession, but the full and constant use of the divine majesty communicated to his human nature. The babe in the manger was not only destined to become, in a subsequent state of exaltation, but *was*, even in his deep humiliation, Christ the Lord,⁹⁾ and his glory was shown forth when the multitude of the heavenly host made heaven and earth resound with his cradle song.¹⁰⁾ When he submitted to the baptism of John, heaven opened and the Father proclaimed the divine Sonship of the Nazarene.¹¹⁾ When he was the guest of humble people at Cana, he manifested forth his glory,¹²⁾ as "the conscious waters saw their God and blushed." He rested his weary limbs and slept amid the angry winds and waves. But when the weary sleeper rose and issued his command, the winds retired and the waves sank into rest obedient to his word and will.¹³⁾ They laughed him to scorn in Jairus' house; but when he gently said, "*Talitha cumi,*" the dead girl returned into

1) Hebr. 4, 15. 2) Matt. 4, 1. 3) Hebr. 2, 18. 4) 1 Pet. 4, 1.

5) Matt. 26, 38. Ps. 31, 10—12; 40, 13; 69, 2—4. Is. 53, 4. 8.

6) Luke 22, 42—44. 7) John 19, 28. — Matt. 27, 46. Mark 15, 34.

8) Acts 2, 24.

9) Luke 2, 11: ὅς ἐστιν Χριστὸς κύριος.

10) Luke 2, 13 f.

11) Matt. 3, 16. 17.

12) John 2, 11.

13) Matt. 8, 23—27.

life and arose; and they were astonished with great astonishment.¹⁾ He knew not the day of judgment;²⁾ but he saw Nathanael under the fig tree and knew what was in his heart;³⁾ he knew what was in man;⁴⁾ he saw the faith of the man sick of the palsy and his friends;⁵⁾ he read the past history of the Samaritan woman;⁶⁾ he *saw* the thoughts of his disciples⁷⁾ as well as those of his enemies;⁸⁾ he knew from afar off that Lazarus was dead;⁹⁾ he knew beforehand the details of his ignominious death and of his glorious resurrection,¹⁰⁾ of the fall of Jerusalem,¹¹⁾ and of the end of the world.¹²⁾ He was in heaven while he taught Nicodemus by night,¹³⁾ and while he sat with his disciples at the pass-over board, he gave them his body and blood in, with, and under the sacramental bread and wine.¹⁴⁾ Now he showed forth his glory as in a flood of light and splendor, as in the transfiguration;¹⁵⁾ and now, again, a single ray beamed forth as from a rend in a garment of deep darkness, as when, by the word, "*I am he,*" he hurled to the ground the band of men who came to lead him captive. But through all the years of his humiliation, from the night of his nativity to the night which shrouded Golgotha in darkness at midday, these rays and flashes of the glory of the only begotten of the Father bore witness to the majesty of the Son of man who, having taken upon him the form of a servant, was yet in the form of God, but thought it not robbery to be equal with God, and being found in fashion as a man, humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.

1) Mark 5, 41 f.

2) Mark 13, 32.

3) John 1, 47 f.

4) John 2, 25.

5) Matt. 9, 2.

6) John 4, 17 ff. 29.

7) Luke 9, 46 f.

8) Matt. 9, 2. 4.

9) John 11, 14.

10) Matt. 16, 21; 17, 12. Luke 18, 31 ff.

11) Luke 19, 43 ff. Matt. 23, 35 ff.

12) Matt. 24 and 25. Luke 21. 13) John 3, 1 ff. 13.

14) Matt. 26, 26 ff. Mark 14, 22 ff. Luke 22, 14—21.

15) Matt. 17, 1 ff. Mark 9, 2 ff.

The purpose of this humiliation of the God-man was the redemption of the world. *In all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people.*¹⁾ The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many,²⁾ says Christ, and St. Paul writes, *Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich.*³⁾ When the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.⁴⁾ The humiliation of Christ was itself an atoning sacrifice of man's substitute. Man had presumed to exalt himself, to be as a god,⁵⁾ and when God said, *Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil,*⁶⁾ he would thereby lead man to ponder what, by his presumption, he had brought upon his race. To destroy this work of the devil, the Son of God was manifested.⁷⁾ God sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins,⁸⁾ also for this sin of self-exaltation whereby man had fallen from his high estate of primeval holiness. And hence the Holy One of God humiliated himself and became obedient unto death to make atonement for our rebellious disobedience. God in his righteousness demanded that man should fulfill the law in perfect love toward God and toward his neighbor. And hence man's substitute was made under the law.⁹⁾ God in his justice demanded that the soul that had sinned should die;¹⁰⁾ and hence man's substitute, to redeem the world, must suffer death, giving his life a ransom for many.¹¹⁾ All this could not have been done unless he, the God-man, yielded himself up to wicked

1) Hebr. 2, 17.

2) Matt. 20, 28.

3) 2 Cor. 8, 9.

4) Gal. 4, 4, 5.

5) Gen. 3, 5.

6) Gen. 3, 22.

7) 1 John 3, 8.

8) 1 John 4, 10.

9) Gal. 4, 4.

10) Ezek. 18, 20; 33, 18. Rom. 6, 23.

11) Mark 10, 45.

*hands, to be crucified and slain.*¹⁾ By the same almighty power by which he had saved others he might have saved himself.²⁾ The word that hurled his captors to the ground might have hurled his judges and executioners to hell. Hence, as the full and continued use of his divine majesty, according to his human nature, would have placed him above and beyond the power of those by whose hands he was to suffer, Annas and Caiaphas, Herod and Pontius Pilate, Jews and Gentiles, and the power of darkness,³⁾ it was necessary that Christ should forego such full and constant use of his divine power and majesty, in order that the work of redemption might be performed and the scriptures might be fulfilled.⁴⁾ A mere concealment, *χρύψις*, of such use would not have answered this purpose, as Christ's suffering and death, his obedience to the death of the cross, was not apparent, but real suffering and death, real submission and obedience, as truly as our transgressions were not apparent but real and required real atonement in kind and measure, adequate to and commensurate with the sin and guilt of all mankind.

What has been conceived and described as *stages of humiliation* in Christology, is, in fact, a series of epochs in the history of Christ on earth, beginning in the darkness of his mother's womb and ending in the darkness of his sepulchre. The stages or epochs which lie between these periods, the birth of Christ, his suffering under Pontius Pilate, and his death on the cross, mark the progress of the work of redemption, for the performance of which the God-man humiliated himself and, hence, also the progress of his humiliation. But there is no specific difference between the humiliation exercised in his death or burial, and that appearing in his conception or birth, it being in each instance *κένωσις χρήσεως*, a progressive abstinence from or

1) Acts 2, 23.

3) Luke 22, 52, 53.

2) Matt. 27, 42. Cf. John 8, 59; 18, 6.

4) Matt. 26, 54—56.

suspension of the full and continued use of the divine prerogatives communicated to the human nature of Christ in and by virtue of its personal union with the divine nature, for the performance of the work of redemption.

The resumption and continuation of such full and constant use of his divine attributes according to his human nature, to which these attributes had been communicated in and by the personal union with his divine nature, was and is the EXALTATION of Christ the God-man, who when the work of redemption was complete,¹⁾ and his Sabbath of rest was over, laid aside the infirmities of the flesh and entered upon a state of glory in body and soul. Having drunk from the brook in the way, he lifted up his head.²⁾ Having descended in his humiliation, he now ascended in his exaltation.³⁾ And *he that descended is the same also that ascended,*⁴⁾ ὁ καταβὰς αὐτὸς ἐστιν καὶ ὁ ἀναβάς. It was the God-man, who was humiliated; it was also the God-man who was exalted, the same person and according to the same nature, that nature which alone could be humbled and which alone could be exalted. It is, in fact, by this argument that St. Paul shows the words of the psalmist quoted Eph. 4, 8 from Ps. 68, 18 to be a Messianic prophecy, that the Lord addressed in the psalm must be Christ. He who had been made lower than the angels[•] was crowned with glory and honor,⁵⁾ according to that nature according to which he had been made lower and according to which alone he could be exalted and crowned with glory. But that glory was not first conferred upon him in his state of exaltation, but was the same glory which had been his before, which he had with the Father *before the world was,*⁶⁾ the *glory of the only begotten of the Father,*⁷⁾ which had been *his glory,* which the Father *had given him,*⁸⁾ even in the days of his state of humiliation.⁹⁾ It was in those days,

1) John 19, 28—30. Τετέλεσται. 2) Ps. 110, 7. 3) Eph. 4, 10.
 4) Ibid. 5) Hebr. 2, 7. 6) John 17, 5.
 7) John 1, 14. 8) John 17, 24. 9) Ibid.

and before the Son of man was humbled before Pontius Pilate and Herod and died on the cross, that Peter and others *beheld his glory, as he dwelt among them,*¹⁾ and *were eyewitnesses of his majesty.*²⁾ Not as to the possession of divine majesty, but as to its manifestation and use, the state of exaltation differs from that of humiliation. When God highly exalted the God-man according to his human nature, he *gave him a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord.*³⁾ A name is that whereby a person or thing is commonly known and called, recognized by and made known to others. In his humiliation Christ was tempted by the devil.⁴⁾ But when, after his quickening in the sepulchre,⁵⁾ he, according to that nature according to which he had been put to death and quickened,⁶⁾ his human nature, *went and preached unto the spirits in prison,*⁷⁾ he appeared in the abode of the angels that sinned and were delivered into chains of darkness,⁸⁾ and manifested his glory as a herald of his victory and of the righteous judgment of those who are there confined with the condemned spirits because of their unbelief.⁹⁾ The descent of Christ glorified into hell was not a part of the work of redemption, but a manifestation of the glory of Christ, the triumphant conqueror of the powers of darkness, and the majestic judge of the quick and the dead, himself heralding his conquest and making his enemies his footstool,¹⁰⁾ not preaching salvation but condemnation and judgment to those who had during their temporal life despised the longsuffering of God and the word whereby they might have been saved if they had not

1) John 1, 14.

2) 2 Pet. 1, 16 f. Cf. Matt. 17, 1 ff.

3) Phil. 2, 9—11.

4) Matt. 4, 1 ff.

5) 1 Pet. 3, 18: ζωποιηθεῖς.

6) Ibid.

7) 1 Pet. 3, 18. 19.

8) 2 Pet. 2, 4.

9) 1 Pet. 3, 19. 20.

10) Ps. 110, 1. Hebr. 1, 13.

frustrated the grace of God by unbelief.¹⁾ Christ's resurrection, by which the God-man,²⁾ according to his human nature,³⁾ with the same body which was laid in the grave,⁴⁾ but in a glorified state,⁵⁾ came forth from his sepulchre on the third day after his burial,⁶⁾ was a public and glorious manifestation of the divine Sonship of Christ,⁷⁾ and also the divine acknowledgment of the completeness and sufficiency of our redemption,⁸⁾ a proclamation of his victory over sin and death and the infernal host,⁹⁾ a confirmation of the truth of his doctrine,¹⁰⁾ and the first fruit of the resurrection of all believers.¹¹⁾ Christ's ascension into heaven was the glorious termination of his visible conversation with his church on earth¹²⁾ and the visible¹³⁾ entrance of the God-man¹⁴⁾ according to his human nature¹⁵⁾ into his heavenly kingdom,¹⁶⁾ in which, while he is ever present with his church on earth,¹⁷⁾ he is being worshiped and adored in his glory by the heavenly host.¹⁸⁾ Christ's sitting at the right hand of God the Father Almighty,¹⁹⁾ is the full and constant

1) 1 Pet. 3, 19. 20. — (Cf. 1 Pet. 4, 6. The preaching of the gospel "to them that are dead" here referred to is not the preaching of Christ to the spirits in prison referred to in 1 Pet. 3, but the preaching of the gospel by Noah and other "preachers of righteousness" to the people of their times, who were then living, but have since departed this life and are now dead.)

2) Rom. 1, 3. 4; 6, 4. 9; 8, 11. Acts 2, 24.

3) Mark 16, 6. Matt. 17, 23. Rom. 1, 3. 4; 6, 4. 9; 8, 11. 34. 2 Cor. 5, 15. Matt. 28, 5. 6.

4) Matt. 28, 6. Luke 24, 39. 40. John 20, 20. 25. 27.

5) Luke 24, 26. 31. Rom. 6, 4. 9.

6) Matt. 17, 22. 23; 20, 19. Luke 24, 6. 7. John 2, 19 f.

7) Rom. 1, 4. 8) Rom. 4, 25; 8, 34. Mark 16, 6.

9) Rom. 6, 9. Rev. 1, 17. 18. Col. 2, 15.

10) Matt. 28, 6. Luke 24, 6. 7. 44. 1 Cor. 15, 14—18. John 2, 18—21.

11) John 14, 19; 11, 25. 26. 1 Cor. 15, 20. 1 Thess. 4, 14. 1 Pet. 1, 3. Hebr. 13, 20. Eph. 1, 20—23; 4, 15.

12) Luke 24, 51. Acts 1, 11. 13) Acts 1, 9—11.

14) Mark 16, 19. Ps. 47, 5. John 3, 13.

15) John 3, 13. Acts 1, 11.

16) 2 Tim. 4, 18. John 17, 24. Mark 16, 19. Eph. 4, 10.

17) Matt. 18, 31; 28, 20. 18) Matt. 25, 31. Rev. 5, 6.

19) Mark 16, 19. Eph. 1, 20. Hebr. 1, 3. 13.

participation, according to his human nature,¹⁾ in the exercise of the universal dominion, rule and government over heaven and earth and all creatures,²⁾ and especially over his church on earth,³⁾ which power and sovereign majesty the Son of God had possessed and exercised before the incarnation,⁴⁾ and communicated to his human nature in the incarnation,⁵⁾ but from the full and continued use and exercise of which he had, according to his human nature voluntarily abstained in his state of humiliation.⁶⁾ In all this the God-man was exalted, not according to his divine nature, which had not been humiliated, but according to his human nature, according to which he was crucified and killed and lay in the grave and ate and drank with his disciples before and after his resurrection. And, again, in all this exaltation there was no increase or addition of divinity; for the Son of man was the Lord, the Son of God, as fully and truly when in his mother's womb⁷⁾ and in the manger,⁸⁾ as when *Thomas said unto Him, My Lord and my God.*⁹⁾ But in the exalted Christ every infirmity of the flesh has wholly and for ever disappeared. While the exalted Christ is as truly and essentially man with a human body and soul,¹⁰⁾ as he was when wrapped in swaddling clothes, the form of a servant has been for ever put away. When the Lord shall come in his second advent, he shall come as the *Son of man,*¹¹⁾ and *every eye shall see him*¹²⁾ and *they shall look upon him whom they pierced;*¹³⁾ but he shall come and appear in his glory, and sit

1) 1 Pet. 3, 22. Eph. 1, 20—23. Hebr. 12, 2. Luke 22, 69.

2) Phil. 2, 9—11. Eph. 1, 20—23. 1 Pet. 3, 22. Acts 5, 30 f. 2 Tim. 4, 18.

3) Eph. 5, 23. Acts 2, 33.

4) Hebr. 1, 8. John 17, 5. Ps. 45, 7. 8.

5) Col. 2, 9. Phil. 2, 6. 7. 6) Phil. 2, 5—9.

7) Luke 1, 31. 35. 42. 43. Matt. 1, 23. Gal. 4, 4.

8) Luke 1, 35; 2, 11. 9) John 20, 28.

10) Luke 24, 37—43. John 20, 24—29.

11) Matt. 25, 31. Luke 21, 27. 36.

12) Rev. 1, 7. Cf. Acts 1, 11. Luke 21, 27.

13) John 19, 37. Cf. Rev. 1, 7.

upon the throne of his glory with power and great glory.¹⁾ And as, on that occasion, it will be made manifest to men and angels, good and evil, that all power is given to him in heaven and in earth,²⁾ and that he is, according to his human nature also, *above all principality, and power, and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come,*³⁾ Christ's coming to judge the quick and the dead may be fitly considered the visible culmination of his exaltation, the closing act of the series beginning with his triumphant descent into hell for the manifestation of him who in his humiliation destroyed the works of the devil, and in his state of exaltation divides the spoil of his victory.⁴⁾

II. THE OFFICE AND WORK OF CHRIST.

The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister.⁵⁾ The work which Christ the God-man performed was not of his own contrivance or done in his own behalf, but done according to the *will of the Father who had sent him,*⁶⁾ and *in his Father's name.*⁷⁾ The *doctrine* which he preached was *not his own, but his that sent him.*⁸⁾ *I have not spoken of myself, he says, but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak,*⁹⁾ and when he shall come to judge the quick and the dead, it will be according as the Father *has ordained,*¹⁰⁾ *God judging the secrets of men by Jesus Christ.*¹¹⁾ The work of the God-man in the execution of the plan of salvation was and is *official work, committed to the Christ of God.*¹²⁾ For the performance of this official work

1) Matt. 25, 31. Luke 21, 27.

2) Matt. 28, 18.

3) Eph. 1, 20—22. Cf. Phil. 2, 9—11.

4) Is. 9, 3; 53, 12. Matt. 25, 32—34.

5) Matt. 20, 28. Mark 10, 45.

6) John 14, 31. Luke 22, 42. John 5, 30; 6, 38.

7) John 10, 25. 8) John 7, 16. 9) John 12, 49. Cf. 8, 28.

10) Acts 17, 31. 11) Rom. 2, 16. 12) Luke 9, 20.

he came into the world. *To this end was he born, and for this cause came he into the world, that he should bear witness to the truth.*¹⁾ God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law.²⁾ The babe in the manger was not to become, but was *Christ the Lord,*³⁾ anointed for the office indicated by the name, *Jesus, which was so named by the angel before he was conceived in the womb.*⁴⁾ Not from the day of his baptism, not only after his resurrection, but from his conception, he was the Christ, and whatever the God-man did and suffered, at Bethlehem and Nazareth, at Capernaum and Gethsemane and Golgotha, was in performance of his official work. Nor has Christ been divested of his office in his exaltation. He is still our *advocate with the Father,*⁵⁾ who *is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us,*⁶⁾ a *priest for ever,*⁷⁾ a king whose kingdom shall be *without end, established from henceforth even for ever.*⁸⁾

The office of the God-man is in substance *one*, as his work is one, salvation, the work of the SAVIOR. But as the various functions of this work may be grouped together under two or three heads, the office itself may be looked upon as twofold, sacerdotal and royal, or threefold, prophetic, sacerdotal, and royal, Christ being, in the Scriptures, described and named as a *Prophet,*⁹⁾ *Priest,*¹⁰⁾ and *King.*¹¹⁾ As these are not three successive offices conferred upon Christ at different times, but so many phases of the one office conferred upon him when the Word was made flesh, in each of which the God-man is eminently Christ the Savior, it is immaterial in what order they may be considered. But since,

1) John 18, 37.

2) Gal. 4, 4. 5.

3) Luke 2, 11: ὅτι ἐστιν Χριστός.

4) Luke 2, 21. Cf. 1, 31. Matt. 1, 21. 25.

5) 1 John 2, 1. 6) Rom. 8, 34.

7) Hebr. 7, 21.

8) 2 Sam. 7, 12. Is. 9, 7. Luke 1, 33.

9) John 6, 14. 10) Hebr. 5, 6.

11) John 18, 37.

in our day, Christ the Prophet, or, more recently, Christ the King, is given undue and untrue prominence before and above Christ the Priest, by the neglect and obscuration or perversion of whose sacerdotal work the Prophet is robbed of the foundation and better part of his doctrine, and the King is deprived of the better portion of his kingdom, it may be proper first to consider

CHRIST THE PRIEST.

Man's first estate was a state of union and communion with God. This state was not conditioned upon a covenant of works the terms of which were to be performed by man, but was established by the Creator himself when he made man in his image and likeness. Man's full conformity with God and his holy will, his primeval holiness, was not a product of his own exertions, but a concreated endowment, a work of divine goodness. It was not man but God who was the cause of that state of union and communion, and not a concurrent cause, leaving man to contribute his share toward the establishment of such blissful relation, but the sole and sufficient cause. If man had continued to live in that estate, the enjoyment of the relation and its blessings had been man's, but the glory, God's alone, and our song of praise must then as now have been, *Serve the Lord with gladness: come before his presence with singing. Know ye that the Lord he is God; it is he that hath made us, and not we ourselves, to be his people and the sheep of his pasture.*¹⁾

But when man fell from his first estate, *his iniquities separated between him and his God.*²⁾ It was not God who brought about this separation, but man under the temptation of Satan. God did not turn his face from man, but *your sins have hid his face from you*, says the prophet,³⁾ and even now the Lord spreads out his hands all the day unto a rebellious people, which walketh in a way that is not

1) Ps. 100, 2. 3.

2) Is. 59, 2.

3) Ibid.

good, after their own thoughts.¹⁾ But the chasm that man had made man could not bridge or fill. For what might man have done to fill that gulf which separated between him and God? Man, whose every thought and act was sinful, could only widen the breach by adding sin to sin. As man may kill, but cannot restore the life he has taken, may separate, but cannot reunite, body and soul, so man had been able to disestablish, but was unable to re-establish the union between himself and God. As God, and God alone, had first established that union and communion, so if it should be re-established at all, it must be by God, and God alone. How? It was impossible that God should ignore man's iniquity. For God is holy, and by his holiness his affections are in energetic opposition to everything not in full conformity with himself, and his wrath must be revealed against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men.²⁾ To reunite man and God, that which separated between them must be put away. The chasm between God and man could only be filled with holiness which would swallow up all iniquity. But whence was such holiness to come? Man was unholy to the core, and his righteousnesses were as filthy rags.³⁾ Angels and archangels were holy; but their holiness was only sufficient for themselves and their own communion with God, and, being angelic holiness, could not be cast into the scales against human iniquity, the transgression of the law as given, not to angels, but to man.⁴⁾ Besides, the majesty of God which man's rebellion had violated was infinite, and all the holiness of all the hosts of angels taken together was finite as the created spirits themselves. There was, then, but one holiness left which would be adequate to the task of redeeming the fallen race, and that was the holiness of God himself. And *God so loved the world that*

1) Is. 65, 2.

2) Rom. 1, 18.

3) Is. 64, 6.

4) E. g., *Thou shalt honor thy father and thy mother. Thou shalt not commit adultery. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife.*

he gave his only begotten son.¹⁾ In this was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.²⁾ But while nothing less than God would do to make propitiation for the sins of the world, more was requisite. Sin was not only a malady which must be healed, but sin involved guilt which must be atoned for. The soul that sinneth, it shall die,³⁾ and cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.⁴⁾ Could God die? Could God be cursed? And if not, could he be the propitiation for our sins which separated between us and God? And, furthermore, the law, the unalterable will of God to man, demanded of man not divine but human righteousness, the fulfillment of the law as given to man. Who was God's neighbor that he should love his neighbor as himself? Behold not only the love but also the wisdom of God! When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.⁵⁾

Here, then, was the priest who might step into the chasm separating God and man. Here God was in Christ reconciling the sinners, and made higher than the heavens.⁶⁾

Such is the priest, Christ, the God-man. And such is, likewise, the sacrifice. *Christ hath loved us, and hath given HIMSELF FOR US as an OFFERING and a SACRIFICE TO GOD for a sweetsmelling savor.⁷⁾ Christ offered HIMSELF without spot TO GOD.⁸⁾ He gave HIMSELF for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity.⁹⁾ Thus did the prophet of old*

1) John 3, 16.

2) 1 John 4, 9, 10.

3) Ezek. 18, 4, 20.

4) Gal. 3, 10.

5) Gal. 4, 4, 5.

6) Hebr. 7, 26.

7) Eph. 5, 2.

8) Hebr. 9, 14. Cf. 7, 27: *When he offered up himself.*

9) Tit. 2, 14.

behold the Servant of the Lord as being at the same time the sacrifice. *He was wounded for our transgressions; he was bruised for our iniquities. The chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed. . . . The Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all.*¹⁾ Not by the blood of goats and calves, but by HIS OWN blood did this High Priest enter into the holy place.²⁾ Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.³⁾ By this sacrifice were we redeemed, with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.⁴⁾ By giving HIMSELF a ransom for all, Christ, the High Priest, was the MEDIATOR between God and men.⁵⁾ Having offered HIMSELF, he is the MEDIATOR of the new testament.⁶⁾ By sanctifying HIMSELF for our sakes,⁷⁾ the Holy One in Israel supplied that holiness whereby we might be sanctified before God and reunited with Him, from whom we had been separated by our iniquities.

This vicarious self-sanctification of the Mediator between God and men consisted, first, in a complete fulfillment of all the precepts of the law,⁸⁾ the active obedience of man's Substitute to the law of which he, the Law-giver, was the sovereign Lord, the law not imposed upon him but upon man, and which fallen man could not fulfill. Thus by the obedience of one many were made righteous.⁹⁾ He took upon himself the duty of all men and fulfilled what we owed, loving the Father above all things,¹⁰⁾ loving the brethren to the end,¹¹⁾ loving his enemies and those who reviled him.¹²⁾ Thus did he present himself, body and soul, a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God.¹³⁾

1) Is. 53, 5 f. Cf. 52, 13 ff.

2) Hebr. 9, 12. 13.

3) John 1, 29.

4) 1 Pet. 1, 19.

5) 1 Tim. 2, 5. 6.

6) Hebr. 9, 14. 15.

7) John 17, 19.

8) Hebr. 10, 7. Luke 2, 51. Rom. 5, 19. Gal. 4, 4. 5. John 14, 31; 13, 1. John 8, 46.

9) Rom. 5, 19.

10) John 14, 31.

11) John 13, 1.

12) Luke 23, 34. 1 Pet. 2, 23.

13) Rom. 12, 1.

And being holy from everlasting and from his conception, the Holy One of God, personally exalted above the law and its demands, this holiness of life under the law, in the performance, not of *his*, but of *our* duty, was a vicarious sacrifice; not only ἀντὶ πολλῶν,¹⁾ but also ὑπὲρ αἰτῶν,²⁾ for them, for their benefit, did he sanctify himself, acquiring a righteousness which should be imputed to them in the judgment of God.

But the righteous judgment of God demanded more. Our non-fulfillment of the law was sin, and sin implies guilt, the reverse of merit; sin against which God's holiness reacted as righteous wrath; guilt which clamored for just retribution.³⁾ *Unto them that obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil;*⁴⁾ and the soul that sinneth, it shall die...; for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die.⁵⁾ Such was the unalterable will of God; and hence the *passive obedience*,⁶⁾ wherein Christ, as all men's substitute⁷⁾ being made sin and a curse for us,⁸⁾ suffered in our stead and for our benefit that which, according to the law and God's righteous judgment, we must have suffered here and hereafter, torments,⁹⁾ and ignominy,¹⁰⁾ death¹¹⁾ and damnation.¹²⁾

By this vicarious sacrifice, the great High Priest rendered full satisfaction to divine justice,¹³⁾ making complete

1) Matt. 20, 28. Mark 10, 45.

2) John 17, 19.

3) Gen. 4, 10.

4) Rom. 2, 8 f.

5) Ezek. 18, 20, 26. Cf. Rom. 6, 23.

6) Phil. 2, 8. Hebr. 5, 8. Ps. 40, 13. Acts 1, 3; 3, 18. Matt. 16, 21; 17, 12. Mark 8, 31. Luke 17, 25; 24, 26; 22, 42.

7) Is. 53, 4—7. 1 Tim. 2, 6. John 6, 51. Tit. 2, 14. 1 Pet. 2, 21; 3, 18; 4, 1. Rom. 5, 6—8. Hebr. 2, 9.

8) 2 Cor. 5, 21. — Gal. 3, 13.

9) Luke 18, 33. John 18, 22. Matt. 26, 67, 68. John 19, 2, 3. Matt. 26, 38.

10) Luke 18, 32; 23, 35—39. Matt. 27, 27—30.

11) Hebr. 2, 9. Rom. 5, 6—8. 1 John 3, 16. Is. 53, 5.

12) Matt. 27, 46. Gal. 3, 13.

13) Rom. 3, 25.

atonement and expiation for all the sins¹⁾ of all mankind,²⁾ reconciling the world with God,³⁾ propitiating God in our behalf,⁴⁾ redeeming all men from the bondage,⁵⁾ the curse,⁶⁾ and the penalty,⁷⁾ of the law, from all sin,⁸⁾ from death⁹⁾ and the power of the devil,¹⁰⁾ and earning, purchasing, and procuring for all sinners perfect righteousness,¹¹⁾ and eternal life.¹²⁾ Thus, sanctifying himself for sinners, he by one offering perfected for ever them that are sanctified.¹³⁾ Not potentially but actually, not partially but wholly and completely, was the work of redemption accomplished. *Tετέλεσται, it is finished!*¹⁴⁾ Christ's resurrection, not itself a part of the work of redemption by vicarious sacrifice, was a divine acknowledgment of the completeness of that work and the sufficiency of that sacrifice.¹⁵⁾ For, since to God,¹⁶⁾ not to Satan,¹⁷⁾ this atoning sacrifice was made, God, now *the God of peace*, when he brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus,¹⁸⁾ thereby declared that the last farthing of the debt was paid,¹⁹⁾ that all sins had been atoned for, that the penalty had been imposed and suffered, that righteousness, life and salvation had been secured. Whose debt? Whose sins? Whose penalty? Righteousness, life and salvation for whom? Not his own; not for himself; but the debt, the sin, the penalty of those whose substitute he was; righteousness, life and salvation for those in whose behalf the

1) 1 John 2, 2; 1, 7. Tit. 2, 14.

2) 2 Cor. 5, 14. 15. 19. John 1, 29. 1 John 2, 2. Col. 1, 20. Gal. 4, 5. Hebr. 2, 9. 1 Tim. 2, 6. Rom. 8, 32. 1 Cor. 8, 11. 2 Pet. 2, 1.

3) 2 Cor. 5, 18. 19. Rom. 5, 10. Eph. 2, 16. Col. 1, 20.

4) Col. 1, 20. 1 Thess. 1, 10. 1 John 2, 2. Rom. 3, 25.

5) Gal. 4, 5—7; 5, 1. 6) Gal. 3, 13. 7) Is. 53, 5.

8) Hebr. 1, 3; 9, 28. 1 John 1, 7. 1 Pet. 1, 18. 19. Rev. 1, 5.

9) Hebr. 2, 9. 15. Hos. 13, 14. 2 Cor. 5, 15.

10) Hebr. 2, 14. 15.

11) Rom. 5, 19; 3, 25. 1 Cor. 1, 30. Jer. 23, 6. 2 Cor. 5, 21.

12) 1 John 4, 9. John 3, 14—16.

13) Hebr. 10, 14.

14) John 19, 28. 30.

15) Rom. 4, 25; 8, 34. 2 Cor. 5, 15.

16) Hebr. 9, 14. Eph. 5, 2.

17) John 14, 30. 31.

18) Hebr. 13, 20.

19) Ps. 69, 4,

sacrifice was made. Who are they? Not the angels of light; for they are themselves holy and needed no redeemer.¹⁾ Not the angels that sinned; for to them God had given no redeemer.²⁾ But men, they whose nature the Son of God has taken on himself.³⁾ How many of them? All of them; THE WORLD;⁴⁾ Adam and Eve; Abel who was slain, and Cain who slew him; Simon Peter and Judas Iscariot; those who confess him and those who *deny the Lord that HATH BOUGHT THEM, and bring upon themselves swift destruction.*⁵⁾

But while the vicarious sacrifice offered by the Mediator was sufficient, the work of atonement complete, his priesthood did not terminate when his sacrifice was finished. He is a *priest for ever,*⁶⁾ and he is at all times exercising his priesthood. He still mediates between God and man, not any longer by offering sacrifice, but by appearing for us before God, pleading our cause as our advocate, and securing in God's judgment the full acquittal of all who believe in him. *Christ, at the right hand of God, maketh intercession for us.*⁷⁾ He has entered into heaven, *now to appear in the presence of God for us.*⁸⁾ As in the days of his flesh he prayed for them which the Father had given him, and not for these alone, but for them also which should believe on him through their word,⁹⁾ so he ever liveth to make intercession for them that come unto God by him.¹⁰⁾ This is to comfort us in our weaknesses and manifold frailties. We are, as the children of God, earnest in our endeavors to avoid the ways of sin, and are continually admonished to *sin not.*¹¹⁾ And yet, every day we have cause to pray, “Forgive us our trespasses!” But we may rest assured that such petition

1) Matt. 25, 31; 18, 10; 20, 36.

2) 2 Pet. 2, 4. Matt. 25, 41.

3) Hebr. 2, 16.

4) John 1, 29; 6, 51. 1 Tim. 2, 6. 1 John 2, 2. 2 Cor. 5, 18. 19.

5) 2 Pet. 2, 1. Cf. 1 Cor. 8, 11.

6) Hebr. 5, 6. Ps. 110, 4. Hebr. 7, 24.

7) Rom. 8, 34.

8) Hebr. 9, 24.

9) John 17, 9. 20.

10) Hebr. 7, 25.

11) 1 John 2, 1.

is not unheard or unheeded, but it is seconded and sustained *ex officio* by our High Priest in heaven. For, *if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous.*¹⁾ When Satan would accuse us and our conscience would condemn us, we may take courage and say, *Who is it that condemneth?*²⁾ Where our Judge is, there is also our Advocate, who maketh intercession for us,³⁾ pleading our cause, and saying, "Yea, Father, forgive them their trespasses; for I am the propitiation for their sins;⁴⁾ I, Jesus Christ the righteous, am their righteousness. Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory.⁵⁾ By such continual exercise of his priesthood, by day and by night, whether we wake or sleep, and especially when foes beset us, temptations surround us, dangers threaten us, yea, in our last agony, he promotes our salvation, not only for the love he bears us, but also in the faithful performance of his office as a faithful high priest,⁶⁾ being able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.⁷⁾

A. G.

(To be concluded.)

PARAGRAPHS ON THE TEMPERANCE QUESTION.

§ I.

Temperance, as now commonly understood in connection with the temperance question, is the total abstinence from intoxicating beverages. This *usus loquendi* is, in fact, an *abusus* based upon and expressive of perverted notions, much as, owing to false notions of marriage and sexual purity, *chastity*, by an abuse of the term, was made to stand for *celibacy*.

1) 1 John 2, 1.

2) Rom. 8, 33.

3) Ibid.

4) 1 John 2, 2.

5) John 17, 24.

6) Hebr. 2, 17.

7) Hebr. 7, 25.

§ II.

The temperance question must be viewed either as an ethical question or as a political question. It is either the one or the other, not both.

§ III.

Ethically conceived, the temperance question must be, in substance, this: "Is total abstinence from intoxicants enjoined by the law of God?"

§ IV.

Politically considered, the temperance question must be, in substance, this: "Is it expedient for the state to prohibit the production and sale of intoxicants?"

§ V.

As an ethical question, the temperance question can be definitely and conclusively answered only from and according to the word of God.

§ VI.

The word of God nowhere enjoins total abstinence from intoxicating drink, but only prohibits its abuse, while its moderate use is distinctly sanctioned by the word of God and the example of Christ and his apostles. Eph. 5, 18. Rom. 13, 13. 14. Gal. 5, 21. Luc. 21, 34.—Ps. 104, 15. John 2, 3—11. Matt. 26, 27—29. Luke 22, 17. 18. 1 Tim. 4, 4 f.; 5, 23. Col. 2, 16.

§ VII.

Hence, even if it were the duty of the state to enforce the moral law, prohibition of intoxicants could not on that account be the duty of the state or its citizens, since the moral law does not prohibit the moderate use of fermented drink.

§ VIII.

As a political question, the temperance question can not and must not be answered from the word of God, and it is not of the province of the state and civil legislation to deal with intemperance as a sin against the law of God, the moral law, but only as a *malum civile*, whereby the civil rights and temporal welfare of individuals or communities are endangered or infringed. Matt. 22, 21. 1 Pet. 2, 13. See THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. III, pp. 434 ff.

§ IX.

Forasmuch as the cardinal purpose of the state is the protection of society and its members, it is incumbent upon the state to regulate the production and sale of intoxicants in a manner and measure sufficient to afford protection to society and its members. 1 Tim. 2, 2. Rom. 13, 3. 4. 6.

§ X.

Proper civil legislation being the first and fundamental measure toward such protection, it is the duty of every one who has a share in the exercise of the legislative power of the state to contribute his due share toward the enactment of such laws as will best serve the purpose of the state. Jer. 29, 7. Rom. 12, 7; 13, 6.

§ XI.

Inasmuch as the enactments of civil or political legislation are concerned about the *justitia civilis*, their form and substance is not determined by the word of God, but by the dictates of human reason, and subject to the private judgment of those whose duty it is to contribute toward or assist in such enactments. Luke 12, 14. 1 Pet. 2, 13.

§ XII.

Thus, while it must be admitted that the abuse to which intoxicants and the places where they are dispensed are subject does not of moral necessity preclude their right and

proper use, the question whether prohibition, or license, or local option, or some other method of dealing with the liquor question by civil legislation or the police power of the state, is best adapted to restrict the *malum civile* of intemperance must be committed to the private judgment of the citizens, or of those in whom the legislative power is vested, and no man's Christian character must be questioned or impeached when he votes or otherwise acts in accordance with such judgment.

§ XIII.

The valid enactments of civil legislation, while in lawful force, are binding upon every citizen, even though they run counter to his private judgment as to their expediency, unless they enjoin a violation of a commandment or ordinance of God, as, f. ex., if the use of wine in the sacrament were prohibited by a law of the state. Rom. 13, 1. Tit. 3, 1. 1 Pet. 2, 13. 14. Matt. 22, 21. Acts 5, 29.

XIV.

Yet, though such laws, while in force, are binding upon all who are subject to them, they do not become part and parcel of the divine, or moral law, but remain *ἀνθρώπων κτισμάτων*, ordinances of men, which may be abrogated by men in due process, as they have been enacted by men, and it is not improper for a law-abiding Christian citizen to exert his influence toward the amendment or rescission of a law which he considers unwise and ineffective, or even detrimental and hurtful.

§ XV.

Again, while a law is law, it is the duty of a police officer or magistrate to enforce such law, f. ex., to arrest, try, sentence, and punish an offender against a prohibition or license law, though in his personal judgment he may

deem such law inexpedient or even hurtful in its bearings upon social life and the prosperity of the state. Apolog. Aug. Conf., Art. XV, Müller, p. 215. Rom. 13, 4. Tit. 3, 1.

§ XVI.

On the other hand, it is not of the province of the church to lend its aid to the police power of the state in enforcing the laws of the state. When the church has administered fraternal admonition and church discipline, she has done her duty. Let Caesar see to the things that are Caesar's. Matt. 22, 21. Cf. Matt. 26, 52.

§ XVII.

Intemperance is a fearful, damnable sin, destroying body and soul. But modern temperance fanaticism, which would make sin what God has sanctioned, and bind man's conscience where God would have it free, is even more dangerous and pernicious than the sin of intemperance and all the evils therefrom resulting. 1 Tim. 4, 1—4. Col. 2, 16. Rom. 14, 3 ff. Gal. 5, 1. 12. 13.

A. G.

Exegetical Theology.

A PEN-PICTURE OF CHRIST DRAWN FROM THE PROPHET ISAIAH.

II. CHRIST'S PUBLIC MINISTRY.

If any one is called to a high office or if he undertakes to carry out a very difficult work, the question is not improper: Is he well qualified for that office, is he equal to the task set before him? Of no man, however, can we predict with indisputable certainty that the administration or execution of his office will be satisfactory in every respect or that he will justify all the hopes and all the confidence placed in him and accomplish perfectly the work which he has undertaken. But with Christ it was different. Heralded by John the Baptist He entered upon His public ministry and set out to accomplish through His suffering and bitter death the redemption of the human race. A more than sufficient guaranty of His qualification for His threefold office and for His final success lies undoubtedly in His divine Sonship. But the prophet Isaiah calls our attention yet to another point or fact by which we are made to understand beforehand that Christ could and would do everything required of Him as the promised Messiah and the Savior of mankind.

Of Christ, the Son of David, we read, Chap. 11, 2: *And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord.* Great honor shall be conferred upon the rod out of the stem of Jesse, or, in other words, upon Christ according to His human nature. The Holy Spirit shall rest upon Him. We know that the Spirit of the Lord rested also on the holy men of God, on the prophets and the apos-

ties, yea, holy Scripture tells us also that the Holy Spirit rests upon all believers or that He dwells in the hearts of all true Christians, but neither of prophets nor of apostles nor of any believer it is said: *And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him, the spirit of wisdom*, etc. Upon Christ rests the Spirit without measure and in all its graces and gifts. This is also indicated by the words of the psalmist when he sings, Ps. 45, 7: *Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness: therefore God, Thy God, hath anointed Thee with oil of gladness above Thy fellows.* The Holy Spirit who rests upon Christ has been called *Spiritus septiformis* or *Spiritus septem donorum*, because seven gifts are mentioned in this prophecy bestowed by Him on Christ. These gifts have been prefigured by the seven branches of the candlestick in the Sanctuary, Exod. 25, 31. The prophet calls this Spirit the Spirit of the Lord or of Jehovah. This term runs parallel with the following and indicates clearly not only from whom this Spirit, who rests upon Christ, comes, but serves mainly to signify a peculiar gift of the Holy Spirit. It is the gift of prophecy (*donum propheticum*) by which Christ shall declare the will of His heavenly Father in words which the Holy Ghost teaches. In a similar manner says Nebuchadnezzar of Daniel the prophet: *In whom is the spirit of the holy gods* (Dan. 4, 8), and Hos. 9, 7 a prophet is called אִישׁ רִיחָן a man of the spirit. The Spirit of the Lord is also a spirit of wisdom. True wisdom penetrates into and knows the nature, the causes and effects of things, is aware of the best ways and means to accomplish the desired ends. Thus the spirit of wisdom makes Christ thoroughly and perfectly acquainted with the plan of redemption and the economy of the church. Upon Christ does rest, furthermore, the spirit of understanding or discernment, בְּנֵה. The spirit of understanding gives to the Messiah the faculty of discerning between good and evil, between that which is wholesome and injurious to His people. As the *spirit of counsel* He enables Christ likewise to invent and give the best

counsel for His people, and not only invent and give the best counsel, but He gives also *strength* to overcome and conquer all difficulties and obstacles which stand in the way of the counsel prompted by Him. The prophet calls this spirit, finally, the *spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord*. This knowledge is, as in many other passages of holy Scripture, a *nosse cum affectu*. The Messiah knows His God, honors, loves Him, to do His will is His meat and his drink, and all this is, according to the context (v. 3—5), to the best of His people. Surely, the One thus furnished and qualified for His office and work will be fully equal to the task set before Him and will not cause any disappointment.

It should, however, not be overlooked that from His very conception Christ possessed the Holy Spirit without measure, inasmuch as the Holy Spirit is true God and with the divine nature of Christ of the same essence and being, and inasmuch as, by virtue of the communication of both natures in Christ, Christ's human nature was really and perfectly permeated by His divine nature, a union which is described in the old dogmatical axiom, ἡ θεότης τοῦ Ιησοῦ παντούτων (the godhead of Christ is the unction of His human nature), and which the ancient teachers have also explained by the similitude of body and soul or a heated piece of iron. The consequence of this real and most intimate union of natures is the communication of attributes (*communicatio idiomatum*), so that Christ possessed all wisdom and understanding, all counsel and might, etc., even according to His human nature from the very first moment of His incarnation, although in the state of humiliation He, as a rule, abstained from the use of this majesty and glory. And, again, it is a characteristic feature of His state of humiliation that, what Christ possessed already according to His human nature, by virtue of the above named union and communication, He received also as a gift of His heavenly Father in order to carry out the work assigned to Him.

Thus only can we understand that great event when immediately after Christ's baptism the heavens were opened and the Spirit descended like a dove lighting upon Him, while at the same time a voice from heaven was heard saying: *This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.* More yet, however, than Is. 11, 2, Is. 42, 1 reminds us of this singular and remarkable event,

There we read: *Behold my Servant, whom I uphold; mine Elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my Spirit upon Him.* Publicly and solemnly as the Father sent down the Spirit upon the Son, while He declares that He is well pleased in Him, so He declares through the mouth of the prophet before the ears of all Israel that the Messiah, the Son of the Virgin, is His Elect, the only One that He has chosen for the accomplishment of the great work of redemption, the One upon whom all His love and all His affection is bestowed and upon whom He has put, to whom He gives His Spirit in all its fulness. In the Spirit of the Lord God Christ appears amongst His people as the greatest of all the prophets, to whom even Moses, the greatest prophet of the old Covenant, looks with admiration as well as with profound longing when he says to the people of Israel: *The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto Him ye shall hearken.* Deut. 18, 15.

We turn now to Is. 61, in which the Messiah introduces Himself as this great Prophet of whom Moses and indeed all other prophets had spoken. In the very beginning of this chapter we find the words: *The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek.* That another prophet could be meant, is altogether out of question, for it is Christ Himself who applies this prophecy to His own person. Luke 4, 17. Having read this passage in the synagogue of Nazareth and closed the book, He said, while the eyes of all were fastened on Him: *This day is this Scrip-*

ture fulfilled in your ears. Here again we meet with the assertion that the Spirit of the Lord, the Spirit of God is upon Christ. Then He proceeds: *Because the Lord hath anointed me.* "Because" is the correct translation of the Hebrew וְיֵה. The LXX has ὅτι ἐνείκει, and Luke as well as afterwards Luther in his German Bible has adopted this version. The latter employs *darum*, and the meaning of these words is evidently this: Because the Lord hath anointed me, therefore His Spirit is upon me. The Spirit of the Lord is the true and proper unction of Christ and it is because He is anointed with the Spirit without measure that His name is קָדוֹשׁ or ὁ Χριστός. He, the Messiah, is qualified and prompted by this Spirit, to preach good tidings unto the meek. The subsequent words: *He hath sent me to bind up THE BROKEN-HEARTED*, נִשְׁבַּרְתִּים, show that the whole prophecy has to be taken in a spiritual sense and that the meek or, rather, the poor or depressed, מִסְפָּרִים, are those that are depressed or poor in the spirit. To them Christ shall bring good tidings. The verb שׁמַּחַת is the Greek word εὐαγγελίζειν, to preach the gospel. Christ's chief office as a prophet was to proclaim the gospel, the good tidings of the salvation of mankind wrought by Himself. The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth by Jesus Christ. John 1, 17. Of course, Christ preached also the law, and the Sermon on the Mount is a fair sample of His law-preaching. At the conclusion of this sermon we read, Matt. 7, 28. 29: *And it came to pass, when Jesus had ended these sayings, the people were astonished at His doctrine: for He taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes.* By the law the hearts are to be prepared for the gospel-message, they are to be broken and melted by that hammer and that fire of which God says, Jer. 23, 29: *Is not my word like as a fire? saith the Lord; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?* The law brings the sinner to the knowledge of his sins, makes him poor in spirit, despairing of his own virtues and merits,

and if we read in the first verse of Is. 61: *The Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek*, the prophet takes it undoubtedly for granted that Christ will also preach the law, with the intention, however, to proclaim to those that have been brought to the knowledge of their sins and have become sorry for them the good tidings of the grace of God, the forgiveness of their sins, and to give unto them the certain promise of life eternal. In a similar manner God gives to the ministers of the gospel who are sent in Christ's name the command, Is. 40, 1. 2: *Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned.* Thus Christ's peculiar office and indeed the peculiar charge of the ministry of the new Testament is to preach the gospel in all its grace and beauty. The great difference, however, between Christ and other preachers of the gospel is that Christ brought the gospel to light, that He proclaimed the gospel in His own name and by His own authority, while they receive authority as well as their message from another, namely from Christ who Himself is the Alpha and Omega of the gospel-proclamation. But to convince oneself how wonderfully this prophecy was fulfilled in Christ, we need but look into the writings of the Evangelists and of the apostles who were reminded by the Holy Ghost of the words which Christ had spoken to them and before them during the three years of His public ministry. Everywhere we find words which bring to the despondent and sorrowing sinner an abundance of good tidings and consolation. Yea, the main accusation against Christ produced by the scribes and Pharisees before the Jewish people was: *This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them.* Luke 15, 2.

But Christ's gospel-message is not only a mere indication of good things, as the Reformed Church would have it, much less but an empty sound. On the contrary, it is also a proclamation, a message of singular and wonderful

power and efficacy. In the following the prophet impresses this upon our minds with many words. The prophet or, rather, Christ continues: *He (the Lord God) hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted.* Christ does this by means of the gospel. The gospel sets at ease and rest the heart wounded and troubled by the pangs of conscience and communicates to the sinner heavenly peace, the peace of God and with God. In the gospel Christ applies to the wounds of a broken and a contrite spirit a balm more precious and more costly, than the finest balm of Gilead. But Christ is not only the great Physician or Healer. He is likewise a great deliverer. His mission is, furthermore, to proclaim liberty to the captives and the opening of prison to them that are bound. Through the fall have we all come under the power of Satan, we have been sold under sin, but Christ has come and tells to those that are penitent: You are free, delivered from the power of Satan, from the dread and fear of God's wrath and eternal punishment. He shall gladly receive you as His sons; believe only. Those, however, who believe in this message are really taken out of the kingdom of darkness through the power of the gospel, they have been translated into the kingdom of Christ and made partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light. Col. 1. 12. And not only this, the gospel gives them also strength to walk as the children of God. For this reason says Zacharias in his song of praise, speaking of the fulfillment of God's promises in the time of the new Testament: *That He would grant unto us, that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies might serve Him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before Him, all the days of our life.* Luke 1. 74. 75. "And the opening of prison to them that are bound." When quoting this passage, Luke employs the expression: *And recovering of sight to the blind (μη τοῖς τυφλοῖς ἀνάπτισεν).* In the original μη stands for opening, and since this word is chiefly, if not exclusively, used of the opening of the eyes and the ears, these two phrases denote

essentially the same. To the prisoners or to those that are bound, פְּנִירִים, opening of eyes. Prisoners sit in the dungeon and cannot see the glorious light of the day. Men without the gospel, without the enlightenment by the Holy Ghost are spiritually blind and ignorant as to the true God and the way of salvation, the preaching of the cross is foolishness to them. But the gospel of Christ is of such power *as to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith in Christ.* Acts 26, 18.

The second verse reads: *To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn.* Christ proclaims and brings by His proclamation, which is like the blowing of the jubilee trumpet, the great year of release of which the year of jubilee in the old Testament was but a type. Lev. 25, 9. 40. This year of jubilee is also of much longer duration, it lasts through the entire time of the new Covenant until the day of judgment. We find this corroborated 2 Cor. 6, 2, where St. Paul exclaims: *Bethold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation.* After Christ has ascended to heaven He makes His voice heard through the voice of His ministers. Before His departure from the earth, He Himself gives to His apostles and in fact to the whole church the command Mark 16: *Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature,* and adds the promise: *He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.* But precious and powerful to save as His gospel is, it is not to be trifled with or to be refused with impunity. Therefore Christ continues in the same passage: *But he that believeth not shall be damned.* And in Isaiah He says likewise, that He is also sent to proclaim the day of vengeance of our God. The day of ultimate vengeance is the day of judgment, and at that day all unbelievers shall receive their reward and perish from the way. Ps. 2, 12. It is a sore task for Christ and for all the preach-

ers of the gospel to announce the dire wrath of God to the unbelievers. Christ sheds the most bitter tears when He thinks of the final fate of unbelieving Jerusalem. Much more than in proclaiming the divine wrath He finds pleasure in comforting those that need comfort. Thus, after having dwelt but with a few words on this topic, the Messiah returns at once to the description of the saving power of the gospel. The Lord has sent Him, furthermore, *to comfort all that mourn*. He has kind, encouraging words for all His Christians, whatever their sore or sorrow is. His heart goes out with special love and tender care to those who sigh under the dread and curse of the law. *Come unto me*, He tells them, *all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest*. *Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls*. *For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light*. Matt. 11, 28—30. Those consolations will not only support them under their sorrows, but turn them into songs of praise. For He gives unto them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness. The literal translation runs: To put upon them that mourn in Zion, to give unto them a headdress instead of ashes, etc. In the original the beauty of the passage is heightened by an elegant paronomasia—*phur*, beauty or head-dress, for *epher*—ashes. It serves also to emphasize the contrast of the two words. Through the preaching of the gospel Christ gives, bestows something upon those that have put ashes on their heads, that are mourning or are laboring under the spirit of heaviness. Since ashes were with the Orientals a symbol of mourning the three last terms signify essentially the same, although it is not to be overlooked that the use of three successive synonymous terms tends to give much force to their meaning. Christ's gospel shall take away the most intense and deepest grief and sorrow and give in return a headgear, the oil of joy and the garment of praise. At days of great festivity the Israelites and other oriental nations

were wont to put upon their heads a beautiful turban or chaplet and to pour over them fine oil that it ran down upon the garments indicating thereby the greatness of their joy and gladness. Thus Christ gives and imparts to them that mourn an abundance of gladness and joy. And as one is wrapped up in a garment, so shall the Lord's people of the new Testament be wrapped up in praise. Their joyfulness shall break forth in songs of praise, of exultation and jubilee. Yea, even out of the mouth of babes and sucklings has Christ perfected praise. Matt. 21, 16. But whence this joy? What is the cause of it? What gift is the real incentive to it? The answer is contained in the following words.

The continuation of the prophecy reads: *That they might be called trees of righteousness*, or, more in conformity with the Hebrew text: It is preached, נִזְבָּת, to them (you are) trees of righteousness. To them that mourn in Zion, it shall be told: You are trees, bearers of righteousness. This is the same righteousness by which, according to Is. 53, 11, the righteous Servant of the Lord shall justify many, the righteousness which Christ has acquired for the sinners. The gospel announces to the penitent sinner that he is righteous for Christ's sake, and imparts to him at the same time that righteousness by working faith in his heart. This righteousness, however, is the most precious gift of the new Testament. It makes the sinner, great as his sins may be, perfectly holy and innocent in the sight of God, so that He shall find no cause in the transgressor of His law to pronounce and execute upon him the sentence of death and damnation. Such a gift as the righteousness of Christ is certainly an abundant cause for great joy and exultation. Another name given to the mourners in Zion is: *The planting of the Lord*. They are God's workmanship, new creatures. By nature they were dead in trespasses and sins, but now they have been quickened into a new spiritual life, they have risen from the dead through the faith of the operation of God. True conversion makes man God's hus-

bandry and God's building. But all this is brought about by the means of the Gospel revealed and preached by Christ and in Christ's name and authority. We read yet at the end of this prophecy of Christ's mission: *That He may be glorified.* All the above named benefits of Christ bestowed upon us by the means of the gospel shall bring us to glorify the Lord by a sincere devotion and exemplary conversation; for herein is the Father glorified, that we bring forth much fruit. His honor, however, demands also that we abide by the scriptural doctrine concerning the gospel and the conversion and regeneration of sinners. But if any man calls the gospel of Christ a dead letter or ascribes the work of the conversion of the sinner to man's reason, power or virtue, either wholly or in part, in spite of this prophecy and many other Scripture testimonies, he shall know that he robs Him of His honor who declares solemnly, Is. 42, 8: *I am the Lord: that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images.*

Christ, during the time of His public ministry, did not only proclaim the gospel in His own authority and name, but in His own authority He likewise wrought a multitude of miracles, and greater miracles than any prophet before Him. His heart was full of compassion not only with the spiritual, but also with the bodily misery of men, and so He freed from bodily evils many of those that believed in Him, desired and needed His help. But the main object of His miracles was the confirmation of His divine Sonship and the divine authority of His doctrine. This appears from the account given of His very first miracle, the turning of water into wine at Cana. At the end of that account John says, John 2, 11: *This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth His glory; and His disciples believed on Him* (conf. also John 10, 37. 38, etc.). And some of these miracles Isaiah names chap. 35, 5. 6: *Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap*

as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing. By these the prophet refers to the time, when the God of Israel shall come, even Christ, to set up His kingdom of grace in the world. At that glorious time wonders shall be also wrought on men's bodies. *The eyes of the blind shall be opened;* this was often done by our Lord Jesus, when He was upon earth, with a word's speaking, and one He gave sight to, was born blind. Matt. 9, 27. 12, 22. 20, 30. John 9, 6. By His power the ears of the deaf were also unstopped; with one word, *Ephphatha*—be opened,—Mark 7, 34. Many that were lame had the use of their limbs restored so perfectly that they could not only go but leap, as the impotent man healed by Peter in the name of Christ, Acts 3, 8. The dumb were likewise enabled to speak, and no wonder that they were disposed to sing for joy. But that these and many more miracles of Christ which are not mentioned by Isaiah may be also regarded as symbols of still greater miracles performed by Christ on men's soul we can easily infer from a careful comparison of this passage with the context, with Is. 42, 7 and especially Is. 61, 1—3.

But although Christ's miracles gave conclusive evidence of His power and Godhead, He did not step before His people with high pretensions to worldly power, authority and renown. Isaiah says of Him, the Servant of the Lord, chap. 42, 2. 3: *He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause His voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall He not break, and the smoking flax shall He not quench.* The quotation of these words in Matthew, chap. 12, 19. 20, throws light on this passage. Christ comes to His people as the meek and lowly Son of man in spite of His great wonders and powerful preaching of the gospel. It is not His own honor which He seeks, He courts not the favor of the high and mighty, not the mere applause of the multitude anxious to see wonders and signs, He tries not to win in order to establish that worldly kingdom of which the Jewish nation dreant. Christ has no trumpet

sounded before Him nor any noisy retinue to follow Him, nor does He care to gain notoriety as a mere worker of wonders. More than one time He forbids the multitude to noise abroad His miraculous deeds, and when at one time *He perceived that they would come and take Him by force, to make Him a king, He departed again into a mountain Himself alone.* John 6, 15. The opposition He meets with, He does not strive against, but patiently endures the contradiction of sinners against Himself. He is a King in spite of all His humility and lowness, but He is the King of Grace and Truth, and the kingdom which He sets up in the world comes not with observation and pompous appearance; its weapons are not carnal but spiritual. By the sweet and gentle power of His gospel He wants to win over the hearts and minds of men from the kingdom of Satan into His kingdom of grace; He makes citizens of His kingdom by speaking comfortably, by consoling those of a broken heart and of a contrite spirit. As one whom his mother comforteth, so does He comfort them. Is. 66, 13. Consistent with the nature of His kingdom and the sweetness of His gospel is also His conduct towards those that resemble a bruised reed or a smoking flax. He does not cast away those that are of little faith, that have but a little spiritual life in them or are oppressed with doubts and fears. On the contrary, He takes special care of them that they might increase and take new courage again. Likewise He does not lay upon them more work or suffering than they can bear, but graciously considers their weak frame. In a tone of reproach He calls His disciples: *Ye of little faith,* He even upbraids them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, yet not with the intention to drive them away from Him, but with a view of making them as cedars in the courts of our God, of fanning the dying spark of their faith into a mighty flame. This great tenderness and care of Christ for the frail and weak in faith is our comfort even to-day yet. If He would break the bruised reed and quench

the smoking flax, if He would not feed His flock like a shepherd, if He would not gather the lambs with His arms and carry them in his bosom or gently lead those that are with young, Is. 40, 10, how could we ever hope to persevere in our faith and to be saved? Surely we had to despair of our soul's salvation in spite of Christ's vicarious suffering and death. But Christ's boundless love and touching tenderness towards the weak and infirm exerted by Him through the gospel makes us quite certain of our salvation, so that in spite of the devil, the world and our own flesh we can exclaim with St. Paul, Rom. 8, 38, 39: *I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.*

Significant of Christ's lowliness and condescension towards the poor and despised is also what we read in Is. 9, 1, 2: *Nevertheless the dimness shall not be such as was in her vexation, when at the first He lightly afflicted the land of Zebulun, and the land of Naphtali, and afterward did more grievously afflict her by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, in Galilee of the nations. The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light: they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined.* A more literal translation of the original is: For there shall not be dimness to the land which was in vexation as about the first time when He made of low estate the land of Zebulon and the land of Naphtali and afterwards He honored her by the way of the sea, etc.

The prophet speaks here evidently of Galilee, the extreme part of Canaan. It was called Galilee or Galilee of the nations, district of the heathen, because many heathen had settled there. At first the land is in great trouble, darkness has befallen it, God has made this country contemptible; afterwards it shall be brought to honor again.

It was at the very time when the prophet was writing this that this country was greatly oppressed. For in those days came Tiglathpileser, the king of Assyria, whom Ahaz had called to his assistance against Pekah and Rezin, and carried the greater part of the population of Galilee captive to Assyria. 2 Kings 25, 29. With great pride the inhabitants of Judah pointed to that country as stricken and smitten of God. And although the inhabitants of Judah suffered the same fate when in later times they were led captive to Babylon, those who returned looked upon the Galilaeans with the same contempt as their forefathers. Amongst other prejudices they entertained against them there was a current belief amongst the Jews that no prophet would arise from Galilee. Quite in keeping with this belief was what Nathanael said to Philip when the latter had told him: *We have found Him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Joseph.* John 1, 46. He says to him: *Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?* But this despised country shall be greatly honored. *The people that walked in darkness,* says the prophet, v. 2a, *have seen a great light; they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined.* Darkness and shadow of death are figurative expressions for misery, trouble and distress, while light denotes salvation and joy. The time afterwards is the time of the Messiah, that light that breaks forth to dispel the darkness, the salvation which brings joy instead of distress and misery is Christ Himself. This appears not only from the following context, but especially from Matt. 4. There the Evangelist relates that Christ, after His baptism and temptation in the wilderness, departed into Galilee, and leaving Nazareth came and dwelt in Capernaum which is upon the sea coast in the borders of Zabulon and Naphtali. Then, after adding the words: *That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet,* he continues to quote this passage. As Christ had spent by far the greater part of His youth in

Galilee, so the greater part of His public ministry was devoted to this province of the Holy Land. In a town of Galilee, in Capernaum, He made for a time His permanent home. It was in Galilee, where He wrought the first and in fact the most miracles, from Galilee He chose His twelve apostles who carried after Christ's departure from the earth the light unto the Gentiles, and there He preached the gospel to great multitudes. We know that even the vast majority of the Galilaeans ignored their God and Savior because he did not fulfill their carnal expectations and hopes, but still He had there more disciples than in Judaea and Jerusalem. He made, of course, also several journeys up into Judaea and to Jerusalem to manifest Himself in the temple of God and before the rulers of the Jewish nation and the multitudes of pilgrims as the promised Messiah and the Savior of mankind. But where it was to be expected least, He met with the fiercest opposition from the very beginning and only a few believed in Him. The reception, however, which Christ found in Galilee and in Judaea, was quite in accordance with another prophecy of Isaiah. For chap. 8, 14. 15 we read of the Son of the Virgin: *And He shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel, for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. And many among them shall stumble, and fall, and be broken, and be snared, and be taken.* We note that he mentions both houses of Israel, but that he points equally to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. These had the temple of the Lord in their midst and had more opportunities to hear and learn the word of God, both the law and the divine promises of Christ the Savior, than the rest of the houses of Israel. Daily they saw before their eyes the sacrifices of rams and lambs which were to be types and figures of Christ: A very great number of those that were appointed to be builders of Zion (Ps. 118, 22) lived amongst them, namely the high priest, a great many of the priests, elders and scribes of the Jewish nation. But their

opposition and burning hatred against Christ and His doctrine grew stronger every time Christ made a visit to the temple and the city, and this hatred resulted at Christ's last journey up to Jerusalem in His arraignment before the ecclesiastical and civil courts in that city, and in His crucifixion demanded by a clamorous and seditious mob which was instigated and incited to this heinous crime by the teachers and rulers of the people.¹⁾

(Contributed by J. H.)

1) A chapter, by the same contributor, on *Christ, the suffering Messiah*, which is properly the continuation of this article, was published in the January issue of the QUARTERLY, pp. 42—67.

Historical Theology.

LUTHER AND LANDGRAVE PHILIP'S DOUBLE MARRIAGE.

Our attention has, from various quarters, been called to an article published in the *Literary Digest* of Jan. 27, 1900, in which the question, "*Was Martin Luther the 'Father of Mormonism?'*" is answered in the affirmative by quotations from *The Catholic Mirror*. To do justice to this perfidious piece of Romanist rancor, we give the article unabridged and place it in the light of history drawn from the real sources of information accessible in our day.

Here, then, is the article from the *Literary Digest*:—

A recent Roman Catholic writer thinks that modern Protestants are inconsistent in their spectacular hostility to Mr. Roberts and the doctrine of polygamy. They venerate Luther and the fathers of the Protestant Reformation; yet these very fathers, he asserts, preached a doctrine not appreciatively different from that of the Latter-Day Saints upon this point. "Civil legislation," he says, "has effected locally a check upon simultaneous bigamy, but the evil is to-day by no means confined to Utah. Its emissaries are to be found in almost every State of the Union zealously planting the seeds of Mormonism, as is ignorantly supposed, but, in truth, the seeds of Lutheranism in one of its most destructive phases on society." The writer asserts that Martin Luther "is the father of Mormonism," and that neither Joseph Smith nor Brigham Young can make good that claim. In support of this assertion, he quotes (in *The Catholic Mirror*, December 23) from the original Latin of Luther's collected works (pp. 119, 123, Würtemburg edition), and continues:

"Here we have the principle of divorce, obsolete and forgotten in the history of Christianity for fifteen centuries,

once more brought to light and promulgated by the apostle of the Reformation in Germany, before Cranmer started the divorce demon in England. But Luther and his coadjutors in the dissemination of the pure (!) gospel of the Reformation did not confine themselves to the trifle of divorce in their practical sympathy with aspirants to the gratification of unbridled lust. Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, appealed to Luther, Melancthon, and other minor apostles of the Reformation in Germany to oblige him with permission to have a second wife *simultaneously with his lawful wife*. The grounds given by the applicant were, that he had never loved his wife; that he had not been faithful to her more than three weeks; and that he could not abandon the dissolute life in which he lived. For these reasons he begs a dispensation to have two wives. In their answer these eight patriarchs of the Reformation reply thus:

“‘But if your highness be fully resolved to take another wife, we judge that it ought to be done secretly; that is, that none but the lady herself and a few trusty persons obliged to secrecy under the seal of confession, know anything of the matter. Hence it will not be attended with any important contradiction or scandal. For it is not unusual for princes to keep mistresses; and altho the vulgar should be scandalized, the more prudent would understand *this moderate method of life and prefer it to adultery, or other brutal and foul actions*. There is no need of being much concerned for what men will say, provided all go right with conscience. Your highness hath, therefore, not only the approbation of us all, in a case of necessity, but also the consideration we have made hereupon. We are most ready to serve your highness. Dated at Wittemberg, the Wednesday after the feast of St. Nicholas, 1539.

‘MARTIN LUTHER,	‘ADAM,
‘PHILIP MELANCTHON,	‘JOHN LENINGUE,
‘MARTIN BUCER,	‘JUSTICE WINFORTE,
‘ANTHONY CORVIN,	‘DIONVSIUS MELENTHIER.’

"Our fellow citizens of the United States will find in the above precious documents the true inwardness of 'the Apostle of the Reformation' and his equally zealous *confrères* in introducing into Christianity, after an absence of fifteen full centuries, the doctrine of polygamy simultaneous (Mormonism) and consecutive polygamy (divorce)."

Of course, we might, in dealing with a Romanist assailant, file a cross bill and demand that he who would come into court should come with clean hands. To think that a writer who, if he were to write the history of his own church, would have to stir up the stench of a veritable Sodom and Gomorrha in the annals of papal Rome and Avignon, should go nosing about in the history of the Reformation and then, with a pretense of historical research, pronounce an absolution over Joseph Smith and Brigham Young which he and his readers know to be false, and impute the fatherhood of Mormonism to Martin Luther, whom he and his readers know to be as little responsible for that abomination as the man in the moon! But we do not feel inclined, at present, to write another *Liber Gomorrhianus*, as Damiani did in the days of Hildebrand, on the sexual life of Romanist ecclesiastics; nor do we deem it worth while to deny an assertion which nobody believes, that Luther was the father of Mormonism. What we would set forth here is simply Luther's true relation to the Landgrave's second marriage during the lifetime of his first wife, not as caricatured from a garbled fragment of a single and much abused document, but as far as it can be ascertained from all the available sources of information on a subject which, to its full extent, never was and never can be a matter of historical record.

In 1523, Philip of Hesse, then nineteen years of age, was married to Christine, daughter of Duke George of Saxony, a woman whom he never loved and to whom he was never a faithful husband keeping himself to her only. He had his grievances against her; but what they were is

not fully known. In a letter to Luther, written in 1540, he says: "I will tell you, under confession, things in view of which you will be satisfied with me; but they will sound bad. God have mercy! May God protect you from similar things! You may know this, because you wanted to know; do not think of anything that is good, but of what is worst. May God punish me if I lie; but I have also proofs."¹⁾ Even as early as 1526, in the third year of his married life, the Landgrave had communicated his complaints to Luther, though not so fully as in later years. And it is remarkable that already in connection with those early overtures the Landgrave broached the idea of a second marriage. But here is what Luther wrote to Philip in a letter of Nov. 28, 1526:—

"—²⁾ As concerning the other matter, my faithful warning and advice is that a man (especially a Christian) should have no more than one wife, not only for the reason that it is offensive, and a Christian must not needlessly give, but most earnestly avoid offense; but also for this reason, that there is no word of God whereon we may rely that this thing is well pleasing to God in a Christian. Let heathen and Turks do as they will. The patriarchs of old had, some of them, many wives; but they were bound thereto by necessity, as Abraham and Jacob, and later on many kings, to whom the wives of their relatives fell by death as a heritage according to the law of Moses. Now, it is not sufficient for a Christian to consider what the patriarchs have done; he must also have a word of God on his side, which may assure him, as they had. For where there was no need or cause, the fathers of old had no more wives than one, as Isaac, Joseph, Moses, and many others. Therefore my advice, especially to Christians, *cannot be in favor, but must go against this thing*, unless in a case of extreme

1) Seckendorf, Comm. de Lufheranismo, III, p. 278.

2) The opening part of the letter, the remaining part of which is preserved in the Court- and State-archives at Cassel, was torn off and has not been recovered.

necessity, as when the wife is leprous or has been otherwise withdrawn. To the others I have no prohibition to make. This is what I would humbly reply to the question submitted by your Grace. Herewith I commend you to the grace of God. Wittenberg, Wednesday after St. Catharine's, 1526.

Y. G.

obedient

Martinus Luther.¹⁾

The Landgrave had evidently understood Luther's attitude toward his plan as being in direct opposition to his desires, and he seems to have dropped the subject entirely in his correspondence and intercourse with Luther. In a number of letters directed to Philip in subsequent years no mention is made of the matter, although, as Luther afterwards learned, the Landgrave's relations and conduct were such as to bar him from the Lord's table.

Now, in December, 1539, Martin Bucer arrived at Wittenberg with a memorial dated Melsingen, Nov. 30, wherein the Landgrave presented his case to Luther and Melanchthon and once more urged his reasons why he thought it permissible for him to contract a second marriage.²⁾ These statements were supplemented by oral disclosures made by Bucer in Philip's name as under confession. What these were, will never be known; they were never divulged, being looked upon as under the inviolable seal of confession. Thus, in a letter to the Saxon chancellor, Brück, written in January, 1540, Luther defines his position with regard to the matter as that of a man who knew nothing of the case, except from hearsay, what every-

1) Luther's Letters, ed. de Wette-Seidemann, vol. VI, pp. 79 f.

2) Corpus Reformatorum, ed. Bretschneider, vol. III, pp. 851—856. This petition was probably drafted by John Lening, a former Carthusian, who was then preacher at Melsingen and on very intimate terms with the Landgrave. The document evidently existed in various copies differing considerably, and there is no possibility of telling which text was submitted to Luther.

body knew. "For," says he, "what I know in secret and under confession, I know before God only, and in secret, and not before men. Nor must I desire to know it. And if I should tell, I must not be believed, according to the maxim that one man's testimony is no testimony."¹⁾

On Dec. 10, Bucer was still at Wittenberg, and it was a physical impossibility for him to be at Spangenberg on the 11th. Yet at that day and place, Christina, in her own hand and over her signature, gave her written consent to a secret second marriage of her "kind and dear lord and spouse," for reasons "well known to him and herself," and in consideration of certain stipulations stated in a similar document executed and delivered to her by the Landgrave on the same day.²⁾ It thus appears that this mutual agreement was made at Spangenberg before Bucer's return from Wittenberg, though the marriage between Philip and the "left-hand Landgravine," as she was commonly called, did not take place till March 3, 1540.

The response which Bucer secured at Wittenberg was dated Dec. 10, 1539. It is extant in Latin and in German, the latter being doubtless the original, written by Melanchthon, who in his correspondence with the Landgrave invariably employed the vernacular. We give a translation of the entire document.³⁾

"To the Illustrious and right Honorable Prince and Lord, Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, Count of Catzenellenbogen, Ziegenhain, Dietz and Nidda, etc., our gracious Lord.

The grace of God and our Lord Jesus Christ for previous greeting. Illustrious and right honorable prince and lord. Forasmuch as your Princely Grace have, by Dr. Bucer, brought to our notice some protracted encumbrance of your

1) De Wette, VI, 295 f.

2) Corp. Ref., III, 864 f.

3) The German text, with various readings, De Wette - Seidemann, Luthers Briefe, VI, 239 ff. V, 242 ff. Bretsch., Corp. Ref., III, 856 ff. — Latin text, De Wette, V, 237 ff. In the editions of Luther's works, Leipz. XXII, 469. Altenb. VIII, 977. Walch X, 866.

conscience, together with an opinion and the delivery of a written instruction given him by your Grace, though we find it difficult to answer in such haste, yet we were unwilling to let Dr. Bucer ride without a written reply.

First, then, we cordially rejoice and thank God that He has helped your Grace out of your sickness, and pray that He would strengthen and preserve your Grace in body and soul unto His praise. For, as your Grace see, the poor, afflicted church of Christ is small and forsaken and verily in need of devoted lords and rulers, as we do not doubt that God will preserve some few, though all manner of tribulations befall.

And as to the question of which Dr. Bucer has spoken to us, our opinion is, in the first place, this.

Your Grace yourself know and understand this, that there is a great difference between making a common law, and in a case, for weighty reasons, and yet according to divine permission, availing oneself of a dispensation. For against God a dispensation, too, will not hold good.

Now, we cannot recommend that by public institution and the enactment of a law every man be permitted to have more than one wedded wife.

But if anything should appear in print concerning this matter, your Grace may be sure that it would be taken and accepted for a common law, whence much great offense and difficulty would ensue. Hence this should in no way be done, and we beg your Grace to consider this, how burdensome it would be for any man to bear the charge of having introduced this law in the German nation, whence everlasting trouble in all marriages must be apprehended.

It might be objected that whatever is right before God must be generally permitted; but this requires proper restriction.

When the thing is enjoined by divine commandment, or necessary, it is true. But when it is not enjoined and not necessary, other circumstances must also be considered, as of this question. *God has instituted marriage thus that*

it should be a union of but two persons, and no more,¹⁾ if nature were not corrupted. This is the meaning of the text, 'They twain shall be one flesh. And this was observed at first. But Lamech introduced the example to have more wives than one generally; which is recorded of him in the Scriptures as an innovation against the original rule. Thereafter this grew to be customary among unbelievers, until Abraham and his descendants took more wives, and it is true that afterwards this was permitted in the law of Moses, as the text says, Deut. 21. *Si habuerit uxores duas.* For God made some concession to weak nature.

But whereas it is in accordance with the original order and with creation that a man should have no more than one wife, such law is praiseworthy and thus accepted in the church, and no other law at variance therewith should be made or established. For Christ repeats this text, *Eruunt duo in carne una*, Matt. 19, and reminds us how marriage should have been at first, before human infirmity.

That, however, in some case a dispensation was used, as when certain men in captivity in a foreign nation were there married and, when again set free, brought their wives with them, or, again, when protracted illness was the cause, as has been at times the case with lepers: if in such cases a man take another wife, with the counsel of his pastor, not to introduce a law, but to meet his want, such we could not venture to condemn.

While, then, to introduce a law is one thing, and to use a dispensation is another thing, we humbly beg that your Grace would consider

First, that by all means this matter must be prevented from being published to the world as a law which any man might be free to follow;

Secondly, that, while it should be no law, but a dispensation, your Grace would consider the offense, that the

1) The Italics are our own.—Ed.

enemies of the gospel will clamor, we were like the anabaptists, who had taken more wives than one at the same time;

Again, that the Evangelicals sought such liberty, to take as many wives as they pleased, as is the custom in Turkey;

Again, what princes do is far more widely published than what is done by private persons;

Again, if private persons hear of such examples of princes, they would have the same permitted to them also, as we see how easily things obtain prevalence;

Again, that your Grace have a wild nobility, many of whom, as in all lands, because of the great benefits they drew from the chapters, are bitterly opposed to the gospel, and as we ourselves know of very malignant language used by some great nobles, it is easily surmised how such nobles and estates would conduct themselves toward your Grace in this matter, if it should be introduced into general practice;

Again, your Grace have, by the grace of God, a highly respectable name among foreign kings and potentates and are feared on that account by those in whose eyes you would, by this matter, suffer disparagement.

In view of these manifold offenses we humbly beg that your Grace would well and carefully ponder this matter.

On the other hand, it is likewise true that we in every way beg and admonish your Grace to avoid fornication and adultery. We have, in truth, been sorely grieved this long time since we learned that your Grace were burdened with such impurity, whence divine punishment, disease and other calamities may ensue.

And we pray that your Grace would consider such extra-conubial abuse a sin of no small moment, though the world makes light of and disregards it. But God has often horribly punished unchastity. For this is adduced as one of the causes of the deluge, that rulers practiced adultery, etc. Thus, also, the punishment of David is a grave example, etc., and St. Paul often says, God is not mocked; adulterers will

not enter into the kingdom of God, etc. For faith must be followed by obedience, that we may not act contrary to the dictates of conscience and God's commandments. 1 Tim. 1 and 1 John 3, If our conscience condemn us not, then we have confidence toward God, and Rom. 8, If through the spirit we mortify the desires of the flesh, we shall live; but if we live after the flesh, that is, continue against our conscience, we shall die. We relate all this in consideration that God will not trifle with such sins, as many people now boldly entertain such heathenish notions.

We were gratified to hear that your Grace earnestly deplore such sins and bitterly repent of them.

Now, your Grace are loaded down with grave affairs concerning all the world, and, besides, your Grace are not of a robust, but of a delicate constitution, and sleep little, and your Grace should, therefore, take care of your body in this respect, as many others are bound to do; and we read of the praiseworthy prince Scanderbek, who performed many great deeds against two Turkish emperors, Amurat and Mohammet, and while he lived protected and defended Greece, and who is said to have particularly inculcated chastity upon his men, saying that nothing so takes away the courage of brave men as unchastity.

Again, if your Grace had another wife and would not earnestly resist the evil habit and propensity, your Grace would not even then be helped. A man must in such external conduct control his own members, as St. Paul says, Yield your members as instruments of righteousness, etc.

Therefore your Grace should, for all these reasons, the offense, other cares and labors, and the weakness of the body, thoroughly deliberate this matter, also considering that God has given your Grace fine young princes and princesses with your present spouse, and must be lenient with her, as many others must have patience in their married state, to guard against offense. For we are by no means willing to induce or prompt your Grace to introduce an irksome innova-

tion. The states of the province and others would assail us if we did, and this would be unbearable to us for the reason that we are, by the word of God, charged to direct marriage and all human affairs to the first and divine institution and, as far as possible, to preserve them therein, and to dissuade all men from all manner of offense.¹⁾ In fact, the world is nowadays very commonly inclined to lay the blame upon the preachers when any annoyance occurs, and human hearts in persons of high and low estate are unsteady, and there is manifold cause of fear.

If, however, your Grace do not desist from your unchaste way of living, since, as you write, this is not possible, we too would prefer to see your Grace in a better condition before God, and that you live with a good conscience for your soul's salvation and for the benefit of your subjects.

If, then, your Grace finally conclude to have another wife, our opinion is that this should be kept secret, as has been above said concerning the dispensation, that is, that your Grace and that person, together with some few confidential persons, have knowledge of your Grace's mind and conscience, as by confession.

Hereof no particular talk or offense would ensue. For it is not uncommon that princes keep concubines; and though not all the people would know what were the circumstances, yet reasonable men would understand and be better pleased with such retired life than with adultery and other dissolute lewdness.

And if conscience is properly disposed, there is no need of heeding all that may be said. Thus far our opinion goes, and this we deem right. For what, concerning marriage, is permitted in the law of Moses is not prohibited in the gospel, which does not alter the policies of external life, but brings eternal righteousness and eternal life, and makes a beginning of true obedience toward God, and would work a restoration of depraved nature.

1) Italics after the original.

Here, then, your Grace have not only our testimony in case of necessity, but also our previous admonition, which we beg your Grace would ponder as a worthy, wise and Christian prince; and we pray that God would guide and govern your Grace to His praise and your Grace's salvation.

As to your Grace's intention of submitting this matter to the Emperor, we hold that the Emperor will deem adultery a sin of little weight; for there is much cause to fear that he has the popish, cardinalish, Polish, Spanish, and Saracenic faith, and would disregard your Grace's petition and put off your Grace with words to his own advantage, as we hear that he is a faithless, deceitful man and has forgotten German ways. Your Grace see that he pays no earnest attention to Christian interests, permits the Turk to remain undisturbed, practices all manner of lawlessness in Germany to increase the Burgundian power. It is, therefore, to be desired that devoted German princes keep aloof from his faithless practices. May God ever protect your Grace, and we are willing to serve your Grace.

Dated, Wittenberg, Wednesday after St. Nicolas', 1539.

Your Grace's willing and obedient servants,
Martin Luther. Philip Melanthon."

To these signatures several were added later, those of Martin Bucer, Antonius Corvinus, then preacher at Witzenhausen, near Cassel; John Lening, preacher at Melsingen, whom Luther suspected of having been at the bottom of the whole affair;¹⁾ Justus Winter, and Dionysius Melander, Philip's court preacher, who solemnized his marriage with Margaretha von der Saal.

If anything at all is clear from this document, it is this, that Luther and Melanchthon held polygamy as an institution to be at variance with the ordinance of God established in the beginning and in the institution of matrimony, and

1) De Wette-Seidemann, VI, 296.

that they looked upon a deviation from this divinely established order as abnormal conduct never to be recommended, but ever to be discouraged and dissuaded, and only to be conceded in particular, individual cases under peculiar circumstances. We do not now argue the question whether this view does full justice to the divine institution of monogamous marriage. But what we do emphasize is that this position held by Luther and Melanchthon is diametrically opposite to the doctrine and practice of Mormonism as advocated by Joseph Smith and Brigham Young, making polygamy a social and religious institution of a higher order, commendable and desirable because of its benefits in this world and in the world to come. Luther was as firmly and uncompromisingly as any man of his or our time determined that the rule, *They twain shall be one flesh*, should remain the rule for all Christendom, not only because of its expediency, but because God has established this rule. We repeat his words above quoted:—"Whereas it is in accordance with the original order and with creation that a man should have no more than one wife, such law is praiseworthy and thus accepted in the church, and no other law at variance therewith should be established. For Christ repeats this text, *They twain shall be one flesh*, Matt. 19." In dealing with sacerdotal and monastic celibacy, Luther spoke and wrote and acted as the Reformer bent upon putting down an abomination and restoring the dignity of marriage as honorable in all, the ministry not excepted. But in dealing with the Landgrave he speaks and writes as a confessor in a given and very peculiar *casus conscientiae*, the circumstances of which were submitted to him as under confession, and his opinion and counsel was never intended for any man but the Landgrave. For this reason he, from the outset and at all subsequent times, insisted upon the observance of strict secrecy concerning the whole affair. This was not a demand made by one who, in the course of events, when the matter had grown troublesome, had seen that he

had blundered. Luther never thought that he had blundered in what he had said and done in the matter. But he held that, as the defense of the adjustment of the case lay in the circumstances of the case, a public defense was impossible while the circumstances of the case were secret and did not admit of publication. That this was Luther's position, to which he strictly and consistently adhered throughout, appears from the following utterances to various correspondents.

On April 12, 1540, when the Landgrave had informed him of the solemnization of his marriage with Margaretha von der Saal, he wrote to the Elector, John Frederick:¹⁾—

"Grace and peace and my poor pr. nr. Most illustrious and noble prince, most gracious Lord, I humbly inform your Grace that I have promptly burned the letter of M. G. L., the Landgrave, lest it be forgotten or mislaid by me and get into somebody's hands. For, God willing, this secret shall not be divulged by my fault. His Grace only write thanks and announce that they have accomplished the work and will keep it secret; for which I have again prayed, that it should and must be kept secret and not noised abroad, as has been previously advised."

In the Archives at Weimar there is a draft of a response from Luther's own hand, as follows:—²⁾

"Grace and peace. My dear Sir and friend. That I do not write to my gracious lord the Landgrave, but to you, at your request, has its reasons. For I am greatly troubled by men of high and low estate, so that I must abide by my *Nay*. For what is a secret *Yea* must not be made a public *Yea*; else secret and public would be the same without any difference, which can and must not be. Therefore the secret *Yea* must remain a public *Nay*, and vice versa, for the reason that *Unius testimonium (., . secret) nullum, Duorum autem (., . public) omnia*. *Sicut ergo nullum et omne, sic*

1) De Wette-Seidemann, 1. c., VI, 258 f.

2) Ibid. VI, 263 ff.

differunt secret and public. This has been and is still my position; I say the Landgrave's second marriage is nothing, and no one can prove it. For as they say it . . . *palam*, it is not true, though it be true as they should not say . . . *clam*.

But herein the Landgrave is unfair toward us, and even to himself, that he would make *palam*,¹⁾ what we have made him *clam*,²⁾ and make an *omne*³⁾ out of a *nullum*.⁴⁾ This we can neither defend nor excuse. Neither would my Gen. 16 do him any good, as I have, both before and afterward, taught in many ways that we must not renew the laws of Moses, though one might secretly in case of necessity, or publicly by order of the civil government, avail himself of what might be chosen for an example. Accordingly, if I were to advise an afflicted conscience in secret trouble, as under confession, to use the laws or examples of Moses, I would not and could not thereby have established a public right or proper example, being a confessor, whose office is not to enact anything as a public right or example, but only to deal with the secret distress of conscience.

But this must be no public right or example, though in times past it was conceded to the dear fathers in the law of Moses, notwithstanding that also in the history of the Christian era some few examples are found of men who were by necessity constrained to have two wives, or by the will of the secular power, as some say of Charlemagne and Valentinian. But of all this we must not make a legal example or custom publicly. For it will not do to say, What you do of necessity, I may do of right. A hungry thief steals bread and goes unpunished; self-defense is murder, but not condemned. But hereof comes no right or example freely to steal and murder. Necessity is above right and example and yet makes no right or example. *Necessitas frangit legem, sed non facit legem.*⁵⁾

1) public.

2) secret.

3) all.

4) none.

5) Necessity breaks the law, but makes no law.

But this pointed discussion will nevertheless leave the splinter in the hearts, that the Landgrave had two wives publicly, and endeavored to trim this thing with words and make it secret; and there will hardly be an end of the quarrel. Therefore I should desire, if it were possible, that the Landgrave would return to the secret *yea* and public *nay*, and *cause teachers and preachers simply to declare that no one may by right or example claim the privilege of having more than one wife*, and to say nothing at all of the secret counsel given or yet to be given under confession. But from the written publication I would abstain. For since no declaration was published saying that a man may have two wives, but all is yet a rumor, and concerning but one person, that of the Landgrave, let rumor go against rumor. Thus the negative would be preached, and the affirmative rumor would in time be easily silenced, forasmuch as a public sermon avails more than a hundred rumors in the taverns and gossips in the streets.

Such would appear to me the easiest way and that the Landgrave, as is his duty, meantime keep this matter secret, not, however, deserting the woman, since he has so solemnly *taken upon himself* that it had been a matter of necessity with him. Thus we, as theologians or confessors, might aid in defending it before God, as a case of necessity which must patch itself with Moses' example. But that we should defend it before the world and *jure nunc regente*, *this we can not and will not do*. Otherwise we shall surely render our services unsparingly."

In a letter of June 27, 1540, directed to Eberhard von der Tann, Luther says:—¹⁾

"I shall, God willing, on my part maintain silence on the confession I received of his Grace through Bucer, even though I should thereby stand disgraced. For it is better that it be said, Doctor Martin has committed a foolishness in yield-

1) Ibid. VI, 267 f.

ing to the Landgrave (for even great men have committed and still commit foolishness, as the saying goes: A wise man commits no small foolishness), rather than I would divulge the reasons why we gave a secret dispensation. For the disgrace and disparagement ensuing therefrom to the Landgrave would be too great."

While attending the convention at Eisenach, on July 20, Luther wrote another response, the original of which is in the secret Archives at Weimar. Here he again declares:—

"As I have from the beginning advised and prayed, so I still advise and pray (and for the last time, since this is all I can do and shall do, and here I let the matter rest) in all humility, that my g. Lord the Landgrave would again retire this affair into secrecy and keep it there; for publicly to defend it as right is impossible, as I said yesterday. . . . And before I would openly aid in defending it, I will rather say *nay* to my own and M. Philip's counsel publicly exposed. For it is not *publicum consilium*, and *fit nullum per publicationem*.¹⁾ Or, if that were of no avail, I would rather confess that, if it should be an advice, and not rather (as it is) a petition, that I had committed an error and a folly, and beg pardon."²⁾

The Landgrave having again written to Luther, importuning him with some animosity to agree to the publication of the whole affair, received a very determined reply, dated July 24, 1540. In this very lengthy letter Luther says:—

"I have received your Grace's writing, which, it appears to me, was penned in a somewhat excited state of mind and in a manner which, I think, I have not deserved. For, as I take it, your Grace are of the opinion that we acted in our own interest, and not in your Grace's faithful and humble

1) not a public counsel and becomes none at all by publication.

2) Ibid. VI, 272 f.

service, to avert future trouble from your Grace. I would, therefore, here state to your Grace from the very bottom of my heart that it is not for my sake that I so earnestly set my entreaties and warnings against divulging the counsel. Your Grace should hold with a certainty and undoubtingly that my interest is not at stake. If all the devils would have the counsel published, I would, by God's grace, know how to answer them so that they should have nothing in me.

For I have the advantage that your Grace and all devils must testify and confess, first, that it was a secret counsel; secondly, that I have with all diligence prayed that it be not divulged; thirdly, that, if it come to extremities, I am secure that it was not divulged by me. While I have these three points, I would not advise the devil himself to set my pen astir, and God will help me. I know by the grace of God how to distinguish between what may be by grace conceded in distress of conscience, and what, without such distress, is not right before God in external affairs in the world. And I would not wish that your Grace should get into a conflict with my pen. Your Grace have enough to do without this, and so have I. . . .

For your Grace will not be able to maintain that the world should accept this secret marriage of your Grace for a public marriage, even though many hundreds of Luthers and Philips and others were led forth in its defence. They will still say, Luther and Philip have no power to establish another right in opposition to the public right now prevailing and worthy of all praise, though they be bound to counsel otherwise in private and for a troubled conscience' sake. . . .

Now, let your Grace consider, if our best friends use such language, what will our enemies say? For such speech will have the effect of entirely exploding our counsel; and those who will may say Doctor Luther believed what was impossible to believe, and has deceived himself and willingly allowed himself to be deceived; though we do yet believe

your Grace were in earnest, and will not permit such solemn words of your Grace uttered in private confession to be made false.

In short, I still beg that your Grace would let the counsel remain a secret, and permit the gossip to rush by and drown, also to withdraw what can be withdrawn, in order that the offense, which cannot be defended, may be stilled.¹⁾

When Justus Menius had written a book against polygamy, Luther, on Jan. 10, 1542, wrote:—

"I hold that *silentium* is in such cases not only *responsum*, but also *optimum responsum*. But the book is not against *us*; for Mr. Just proceeds against a law and public example of polygamy, *which we also do*, and not against a case of necessity and casual dispensation of an individual person, *wherewith we have dealt as confessors*.²⁾

This, in the main, was also Melanchthon's position. In a letter to Vitus Dietrich, dated Sept. 1, 1540, speaking of this *θρηλλούμενον πρᾶγμα*, he says:—

"Wherein we were deceived, not by Aretius Felinus,³⁾ but by Jason⁴⁾ himself, under the pretext of piety, as begging that we would, for urgent reasons, advise his conscience, he even added an oath that he was in need of this remedy. *We responded that the law must be preserved, as the text says, They twain shall be one flesh.* But if there is such necessity, the remedy must be used secretly and without public offense. . . . Nor has he complied with our advice, being overcome by love. *I might mention many other things.* But let us pray God that he would heal this scandal. He says that he will not acknowledge it. But in this business he has often said one thing and done another.⁵⁾

But while it is well known that the Landgrave's conduct, and, especially, the fact that he had been prevailed

1) Ibid. VI, 273 ff.

2) Ibid. p. 296.

3) Martin Bucer.

4) Philip of Hesse.

5) Corp. Ref., III, 1079 f.

upon to be a witness to the left-hand marriage, threw Melanchthon on a sick-bed which, but for Luther's intervention, might have been his death-bed. Luther remained cheerful in spite of all the noise the affair had occasioned; he not only upheld his policy, but also endeavored to cheer up his companion. On June 2, 1540, he writes to Lauterbach:—

"Grace and peace! As to your enquiry concerning the new nuptials of the Landgrave, I have nothing to write, my Anthony. . . . *Let those bark who will bark.*"¹⁾

Two weeks later, on June 15, he wrote to the same friend:—

" . . . There is no news here but that bugbear of the Landgrave's, which some begin to mollify, others, to deny, still others this or that. They lay the greater part of the blame to the door of the Princess of Rochlitz, the Landgrave's sister. *Whatever it may be, the day will shew.*"²⁾

Again three days later, he writes to Melanchthon:—

"As to the Macedonian's³⁾ business, I wish you would not bother yourself too much, after the matter has now come to where neither sorrow nor joy can do it any good. Hence, why should we kill ourselves for nothing, or by sadness obstruct the knowledge of that Conqueror of all deaths and sorrows? Has not He who conquered the devil and judged the prince of this world at the same time also conquered this scandal? For even if this scandal shall blow over, he will stir up new, and, perhaps, greater clouds of scandal, which, if we live, we shall conquer in the same Conqueror, and laugh them to scorn. . . . Therefore, I beseech you for Christ's sake, be at ease and quiet in your mind, and let those whose business it is, also do something, and let them bear their burden and not lay everything to our charge, whom, knowing us to be candid

1) De Wette, V, 290 f.

2) Ibid. p. 292.

3) *Macedo=Philip of Hesse.*

and faithful, they cannot accuse of any crime save that of mercy or the most human leniency. . . . But let Satan go his way. On his account we will neither grieve nor sorrow; but in Christ the Lord we will rejoice and exult; he will bring to naught all our foes.¹⁾

Among those who were ill pleased with Luther's position was the Landgrave. It was a breach of faith on his part when he permitted the written opinion of Luther and Melanchthon to go into other hands, although it had been intended only for himself, and he was continually itching after some manner of public sanction of what he had done. To this Luther, while he scrupulously guarded the confessional disclosures of the Landgrave, persistently refused to yield, preferring, if it must be, to bear the blame of having blundered in his counsel, rather than to divulge those things which had prompted him in what he had done. The Landgrave, however, found others more willing, and, in 1541, a book appeared, bearing the title, *Dialogus, i. e. a friendly talk of two persons, on the question whether to have more wives than one at the same time agreed or disagreed with natural, imperial, and spiritual law, and whether, if a man were to do such a thing at this time, he must be rejected and condemned as unchristian, or not.* The author of the book, who called himself Huldrich Neobulus, was not Bucer, to whom the work was afterwards ascribed, but that ex-Carthusian of Melsingen, John Lening, and his argument in defense of the Landgrave was looked upon as directed against the Wittenberg theologians. But the handling he received when Luther laid hold of him was such that he and his Landgrave might have wished that "the shameful book of Nebulo Tulrich," as Luther called it, had never been written. The casual references to the "fool Melsingen" in his letters²⁾ were certainly far from flattering to the man who "boasted that the Landgrave's

1) Ibid. p. 294.

2) De Wette, V, 344. VI, 296.

cause could be publicly defended.''¹⁾ But in a published review of the *Dialogus*, he took the "shameful fool" to task in a way that probably few dogs in Germany would have eaten bread from the hand of Nebulo Tulrich. "God is Lord;" says Luther, "he may abrogate, change, mitigate his law as he will, of necessity or without necessity. *But it does not behoove us to do the same*, much less to establish a right which must prevail or be an example. But our Tulrich comes along and gives license to carnal lust, and would set up a world as before the flood.''²⁾ He calls it a piece of rascality that Nebulo "introduces the example of the fathers and this or that king, knowing very well that this is not to the point . . . and that the law of Moses does not concern us and is no longer a law, and that we must not consider the examples of the saints, much less those of the kings, but God's commandment.''³⁾ He calls the author *Lupus in ovili*, a wolf in the sheep-fold,⁴⁾ and says:—"If he should come to the light of day, he may rouse me, the old lazy writer, to crush my quill on his head and paint his nose with my ink, as he deserves. But God has found him out, as he has found out others before him. And if any man be desirous of hearing my judgment of this book, let him hear. Thus says Doctor Martinus concerning the book of Neobulus: *whosoever follows this knave and his book and accordingly takes in marriage more wives than one, and would have it to be a right, to him may the devil bless the bath in the pit of hell. Amen.* This I will, thank God, maintain, though it snowed nothing but Nebulos Nebulones Tulrichs and devils for an entire year.''⁵⁾

In the same year, when he published his book, *Wider Hans Wurst*, against Duke Henry of Brunswick, who had called the Landgrave a bigamist, Luther again touched

1) De Wette, V, 344.

2) Luther's Works, Erl. ed., vol. 65, p. 211.

3) Ibid. p. 208.

4) Ibid. p. 212.

5) Ibid. p. 209.

upon the matter, saying:—“In Hesse I know of one Landgrave, and none other will be able to bear and nurse young Landgraves; I mean the Duchess, Duke George’s, of Saxony, daughter.”¹⁾

From all this it appears beyond a shadow of doubt that Luther did not advocate or recommend, but emphatically discountenanced and condemned bigamy; that he did not advise the Landgrave to take a second wife, but earnestly and repeatedly dissuaded that measure; that he never defended the Landgrave’s second marriage when, against his advice, it had been contracted and given a measure of publicity; that Luther’s opinion as to the admissibility of the second marriage in the Landgrave’s case was based upon peculiar circumstances confided to him and never made public either by him or by the Landgrave, and that this opinion was never intended to cover more than the individual case for and in consideration of which it was asked; that Luther never uttered a doubt as to the correctness of that opinion while, at the same time, he rejected and strenuously denied the right of bigamous or polygamous marriage; and that it is preposterous and due either to ignorance, or to malice, or to both, to stamp Martin Luther the father of Mormonism.

A. G.

AN ABUSED DICTUM OF ST. AUGUSTINE.

A correspondent writes to us: “St. Augustine is quoted by Cardinal Vaughan as saying: *Ego vero Evangelio non crederem, nisi me Catholicae Ecclesiae commoveret auctoritas.* A translation is given, which seems to be by the cardinal, thus: ‘I should not believe in the truth of Scripture unless the authority of the Catholic Church so bade me.’ (Literary Digest, Feb. 17, p. 217.) Would you please, if

1) Luther’s Works, Erl. ed., vol. 26, p. 60.

convenient to you, through the columns of the QUARTERLY, or otherwise, state whether this quotation is true, and give necessary comment."

Of course, we cheerfully comply with our correspondent's request. And, in the first place, we would say that the Latin quotation is correct, and the English translation, by whomsoever it may be, is incorrect; for *Evangelio* is not "the truth of Scripture," but simply "the Gospel," and in what sense the word is used in the text quoted from St. Augustine, we shall presently see.

The words of St. Augustine are taken from the fifth chapter of his book *Contra epistolam Manichaei quam vocant Fundamenti*. Augustine cites the opening words of that "Epistle," thus: "Manichaeus, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the providence of God the Father. These are wholesome words from the perennial and living fountain." Then he argues, "I do not believe that man to be an apostle of Christ. Pray, do not grow angry and begin to revile me; for you know I have stated that I do not rashly believe anything you say. Hence, I ask, who is that man Manichaeus? You will answer, An apostle of Christ. I don't believe it. Now, you have nothing to say or to do; for you promised me knowledge of truth, and now you would force me to believe what I do not know. Perhaps you will read the Gospel to me and try therefrom to assert the person of Manichaeus. Hence, if you found a man who not yet believed the Gospel, what would you do if he said to you, I do not believe? But I would not believe the Gospel, unless the authority of the catholic church prompted me."¹⁾

1) Certe sic incipit: Manichaeus apostolus Jesu Christi providentia Dei Patris. Haec sunt salubria verba de perenni ac vivo fonte. Jam cum bona patientia si placet attendite quid quaeram. Non credo istum esse apostolum Christi; quaeso ne succenseatis et maledicere incipiatis. Nostis enim me statuisse nihil a vobis prolatum temere credere. Quaero ergo, quis sit ille Manichaeus? Respondebitis, apostolus Christi. Non credo. Jam quid dicas aut facias non habebis; promittebas enim scientiam veritatis,

And later on in the same chapter, Augustine says:—
 “But far be it from me not to believe the Gospel. For believing it, I do not see how I might believe you also. For the names of the apostles which we read there do not contain among them the name of Manichaeus. But who was the successor of him who betrayed Christ, we read in the acts of the Apostles which book I must needs believe if I believe the Gospel; since both scriptures alike catholic authority commends to me.”¹⁾

Here we have very plainly the sense in which Augustine in this text and context speaks of the Gospel. It is not the gospel as the doctrine of our salvation, nor the entire Scriptures, nor “the truth of Scripture,” nor the entire New Testament; but when Augustine refers to the Gospel and the Acts as *utraque scriptura*, he evidently follows an *usus loquendi* common among the early Fathers, according to which *Evangelium* stood for the four Gospels and *Apostolus* for the rest of the canonical books of the New Testament. We have the same *usus loquendi* when Augustine says:—“I have undertaken to show forth the error or recklessness of those who think they are preferring very cunning charges against the four books of the Gospel which the four evangelists have severally written.”²⁾ And again: “Hence,

et nunc quod nescio cogis ut credam. *Evangelium* forte mihi lecturus es et inde Manichaei personam tentabis asserere. Si ergo invenires aliquem, qui *Evangelio* nondum credit, quid faceres dicenti tibi, non credo? Ego vero *Evangelio* non crederem, nisi me catholicae ecclesiae commoveret auctoritas. Augustini Opera, ed. Froben., Tom. VI, col. 118.

1) Sed absit ut ego *evangelio* non credam. Illi enim credens non invenio quomodo possim etiam tibi credere. Apostolorum enim nomina, quae ibi leguntur, non inter se continent nomen Manichaei. In locum autem traditoris Christi qui successerit, in apostolorum Actibus legimus: cui libro necesse est me credere, si credo *evangelio*: quoniam utramque scripturam similiter mihi catholica commendat auctoritas. Ibid. col. 119.

2) Demonstrare suscepimus errorem vel temeritatem eorum, qui contra *Evangelii* quatuor libros, quos evangelistae quatuor singulos scripserunt, satis argutas criminationes se proferre arbitrantur. De consensu evangelist., Lib. 1, cap. 7. Opp. Tom. IV, col. 375.

when they wrote what he pointed out and said, it can by no means be said that he did not write it, since the members performed that which they knew as the head dictated. For whatever he would have us read concerning his deeds and words, he ordered them, as his hands, to write. Whoever has understood this bond of unity and this ministry of concordant members under one head in various offices, will look upon the narratives of the disciples of Christ which he reads in the *Gospel* precisely as if he had seen the very hand of the Lord, which he bore upon his own body, writing them.”¹⁾

The context of the quotation from Augustine given in the *Digest* furthermore very clearly shows in what sense the author says that he is prompted by the authority of the catholic church to give credence to these books of the New Testament canon. The purported epistle of Manichaeus claimed the dignity of apostolic authorship. This claim Augustine rejects. He denies the authenticity of a work which lacks the testimony whereby its authenticity might be established. On the contrary, he gives credence to the *Evangelium*, the canonical Gospels, their authenticity being fully established by the testimony of the ancient church throughout the world, just as the authenticity of the Acts, which Augustine accepts on the same authority.

This plain sense, as it appears from the context, is also corroborated by parallel passages from other writings of

1) Itaque cum illi scripserunt quae ille ostendit et dixit, nequaquam dicendum est quod ipse non scripserit: quandoquidem membra eius id opera sunt, quod dictante capite cognoverunt. Quicquid enim ille de suis factis et dictis nos legere voluit, hoc scribendum illis tanquam suis manibus imperavit. Hoc unitatis consortium et in diversis officiis concordium membrorum sub uno capite ministerium quisquis intellexerit, non aliter accipiet quod narrantibus discipulis Christi in Evangelio legerit, quam si ipsam manum domini, quam in proprio corpore gestabat, scribentem conspexerit. — Ibid. cap. 35. Col. 395. We call attention to Augustine's view of the inspiration of Scripture as exhibited in this passage. The holy penmen are the hands of the divine Head, whose thoughts and words, known to them as by *dictation*, they reduced to writing.

Augustine. Thus, in the XV Book of his great work *De civitate Dei* he says:—"Let us therefore pass by the fabulous stories of those writings which are called Apocrypha, for the reason that their occult origin was not clear to the Fathers, from whom the authority of the true Scriptures came down to us by most certain and well known succession."¹⁾

Again, in the XXVIII Book of his work *Contra Faustum Manichaeum*, our author says:—"Thus also you should believe that book to be of St. Matthew which from the time when Matthew himself lived in the flesh the church in an uninterrupted course of time and with securely connected succession brought down to these times."²⁾ And later:—"If certain letters had been brought forth, which, while no one else made mention of them, were said to be letters of Christ himself: how could it have been that, if they were his, they were not read, not received, did not excel by the very highest authority in his church, which extends from Christ himself to the present time, propagated by the apostles and the bishops succeeding them, the church in which much of what has been predicted has already been fulfilled, and what remains, will to the end doubtless come in the future. For if those letters were brought forth, it would be proper by all means to consider by whom they were brought forth. If they came from him, it was doubtless most likely that they should be brought first of all to those who were then his adherents, and that through them they should also come to others. If this had been the case, they would shine with confirmative authority by the above said successions

1) Omittamus igitur earum scripturarum fabulas quae apocryphae nuncupantur, eo quod earum occulta origo non claruit patribus, a quibus usque ad nos autoritas veracium scripturarum certissima et notissima successione pervenit. Aug. Opp. Tom. V, col. 852.

2) Sic et istum librum crede esse Matthei, quem ex illo tempore, quo Mattheus ipse in carne vixit, non interrupta serie temporum Ecclesia certa connexionis successione usque ad tempora ista perduxit. Contra Faust. Man. Lib. XXVIII, cap. 2. Aug. Opp. Tom. VI, col. 467.

of bishops and congregations. Hence who is so void of reason as to believe to-day that a work set forth by Manichaeus were an Epistle of Christ, and not to believe what Matthew wrote to be the works and words of Christ?"¹⁾

And again:—"What writings shall ever have any weight of authority, if those of the evangelists and apostles have not? Concerning what book will it be certain whose it is, if it is uncertain whether the letters which the church says and holds to be of the apostles, and which were handed down from the apostles themselves and declared so loudly through all nations, be really letters of the apostles?"²⁾

From all these and other passages which might be quoted³⁾ it is evident that it is a familiar argument with St. Augustine to maintain the authenticity of the canonical Scriptures as established by the testimony of the primitive church, and that in this sense he claims the authority of the church in behalf of the canonical Scriptures as compared with the spurious sacred books of his day which claimed credence and apostolic dignity or divine authority while

1) Si enim prolatae fuerint aliquae literae, quae nullo alio narrante ipsius proprie Christi esse dicantur: unde fieri potuerat, ut si vere ipsius essent non legerentur, non acciperentur, non praecipuo culmine auctoritatis eminerent in eius ecclesia, quae ab ipso per Apostolos succedentibus sibimet Episcopis usque ad haec tempora propagata dilatatur, multis in ea jam completis, quae ante praedicta sunt, et usque in finem quae restant sine dubio futuris atque venturis: quia et illae literae si proferrentur, utique considerandum erat a quibus proferrentur. Si ab ipso, illis primitus sine dubio proferri potuerunt, qui tunc eidem cohaerent, et per illos etiam ad alios pervenire. Quod si factum esset, per illas quas commemoravi praepositorum et populorum successiones confirmativa auctoritate clarescerent. Quis est ergo tam demens, qui hodie credit esse Epistolam Christi, quam protulerit Manichaeus, et non credit facta vel dicta esse Christi quae scripsit Matthaeus. Ibid. cap. 4. Opp. VI, 468.

2) Quae unquam literae ullum habebunt pondus auctoritatis, si evangeliace, si apostolicae non habebunt? De quo libro certum erit cuius sit, si literae quas apostolorum dicit et tenet ecclesia, ab ipsis apostolis propagata et per omnes gentes tanta eminentia declarata, utrum apostolorum sint incertum est. Ibid. Lib. XXXIII, cap. 6. Opp. Tom. VI, col. 493.

3) E. g. Contra Faustum Manichaeum, Lib. XI, cap. 2. Lib. 32, 21. De Cons. Evang. Lib. 1.

they failed to establish their authenticity and their canonical recognition by the same church which recognized the canonical Scriptures as the inspired writings of Moses and the Prophets, the Apostles and Evangelists.

We have not seen the article in the *Digest* from which our esteemed correspondent has quoted Cardinal Vaughan, and we do not know what deductions are there made from the much abused words of Augustine. But we know that the Romanists were rebuked five centuries ago by one of their most learned and influential men of his day, Jean Charlier de Gerson, the great Chancellor of the university of Paris, for their abuse of this saying of Augustine,¹⁾ whose doctrine of the divine authority of the Scriptures is not based upon the authority of the Church, but upon his doctrine of the inspiration of Scripture, which might also be exhibited by many passages from his works. Augustine holds the Scriptures to be the word of God;²⁾ and the word of God cannot receive its authority from the church, as the Creator cannot receive his power from the creature he has made.

A. G.

1) Gerson, *de Vita Spirituali*, lect. 2, coroll. 7.

2) See the passage quoted above, *De consensu evangelistar.* Lib. 1, cap. 35.

Practical Theology.

THE PASTOR AND THE LABOR QUESTION.

(Concluded.)

The second fundamental principle which demands recognition in the theory and practice of the labor question is that of *charity*. There are not a few, especially among the laboring people, who object and say, "All we want is justice. Give us justice, and we have no need of charity." But this is another falsehood. God certainly knew better, and He has established the law of charity, *Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself*, as a provision for the welfare, also the temporal welfare, of mankind. The interdependence of the members of society is such that charity is an indispensable requisite of a prosperous and enjoyable human community. God himself has made charity a factor of human happiness. Charity is all the more needful in a world of shortcomings and distress in all the various ways of life. The man who selfishly looks solely to his own interests and to the interests of others only inasmuch as his own interests are bound up and dependent upon theirs, is a standing menace and hindrance to the welfare of human society and of its members. By his selfishness he is disposed to look upon all whose interests may be or seem to be clashing with his own as his personal enemies, and to set all his energies against anything they may do to promote their own interests. And this is the animus that pervades the world of labor to-day. The laborer does not look upon his employer as a friend, but as an antagonist against whom he must be on his guard. When a scale of wages is to be prepared, the trade-union does not confer with the employers to learn or deliberate what the mutual interests of the parties may demand or permit. The Union fixes the scale, and it is submitted to the bosses for

acceptance. Refusal to accept the terms thus prescribed means war in the form of a strike or boycott. If arbitration is at all admitted, it is as between contending parties under threat of severer measures. The fellow laborer is considered a friend only while he sides with the Union. Let him go his own way and work at terms agreed upon between himself and the employer, and he is at once regarded as an enemy whose dismissal is demanded and enforced. The dealer or consumer who patronizes the employer with whom the Union is at war is likewise put down as an enemy and may risk being disciplined by a boycott. If the recalcitrant party is ruined by strike or boycott, or if the "scab" who is driven from the shop or building premises is reduced to starvation with his family, all the better; their example may deter others from defying the wrath of the Union. Let the consequence of a miners' strike be a coal famine, the closing down of factories employing thousands of other laboring men, distress in countless homes of the poor for want of fuel: what is all this and more to the strikers? They must see to their interests, let it cost others what it may. On the other hand, if employers think they can gain by taking the offensive, they declare a lockout regardless of the misery they may inflict upon the men and those who depend upon their labor. Employers or employees who may in other ways exercise benevolence to the needy and afflicted with willing hearts and open hands, when it comes to their struggles over the labor question will throw all charity to the winds and fight, simply and relentlessly fight while they can and only submit as to a prevailing enemy. Such is the spirit which actuates the parties to the labor problem of the present day. The acts of violence so often committed in connection with labor troubles are not merely incidental concomitants, but are outbreaks of the hostility which is at the bottom of the conflict of interests and constitutes the very soul of the industrial warfare of which strikes and boycotts and lockouts are merely the pitched battles of a permanent campaign.

But here the question will arise, Was not selfishness a mainspring in all ages since the fall of man from his first estate? Why is it that labor troubles have become a feature of our age as distinguished from earlier periods of the history of the human race?

To answer this question intelligently, it will be necessary to place ourselves face to face with the industrial system now prevalent in modern civilized society as distinguished from earlier forms of industrial life.

The society of classical antiquity was largely monopolistic, inasmuch as a comparatively small part of the population of a territory, the aristocracy, held undisputed sway not only in political, but also in industrial life, while the great mass of laborers were slaves or serfs, or freemen considered little better than slaves or even beneath them. Manual labor and working for wages was looked upon as disgraceful among the Greeks and Romans, and Herodotus remarks that such was the case also among the Egyptians, Thracians, Scythians, Persians, Lydians, and nearly all the barbarian nations.¹⁾ The trades were largely in the hands of manufacturers, who carried on the various industries in extensive shops, in which they employed slave labor. Agriculture, too, was conducted on a large scale, the work being done by slaves or serfs for the land owners, most of whom never touched an implement. Commerce even, though carried on by wholesale dealers and speculators with their own and other people's money, and by ships manned with slaves, was looked upon as a sordid occupation. The laboring masses enjoyed protection in a measure to secure their subsistence. There were, f. e., laws to regulate the land owner's share of the crops raised on his plantations. But all the efforts of legislators to elevate the social and economic standing of the wageworker proved of no avail, and in spite of various measures for the prohibition of idle-

1) 2, 166. 167.

ness, and in view of the success of some who by thrift and talent succeeded in accumulating a competency which would raise them to a degree of respectability, the states had to deal with a growing proletariat of free subjects who, rather than to contaminate themselves with working for a living, would claim the means of subsistence at the doors of the aristocracy or at the expense of the state. What competition there was, naturally existed among the employers of labor rather than among laborers or between laborers and their employers.

The industrial institutions of the middle ages were also largely monopolistic. The mediaeval guilds were close corporations which held the exclusive right of exercising their respective handicrafts. The number of masters, journeymen, and apprentices was strictly limited by law with a view of maintaining a balance of supply and demand, and the measure and methods of production were regulated into minute detail by codes of rules and statutes. Competition was thus reduced to a minimum, and a fair living was permanently secured to all who were members of a craft in good standing. This system was extensively in force in recent centuries. An author of the first half of the eighteenth century¹⁾ defines these fraternities, *Collegium Opificum est trium plerumque personarum ejusdem conditionis, professio- nis, opificii, vel ordinis legitima Societas*, i. e., "A college of working men is a lawful society of three or more persons of the same condition, industrial profession, or order." He divides them into determinate and indeterminate sodalities. The former are those, *quae certum et stativum, tam Magistrorum quam Discipulorum numerum habent, vel etiam pro angustia loci ultra hominum memoriam certum et determinatum personarum numerum observarunt*, i. e., "which have a certain and stationary number of masters and disciples, or have, because of the smallness of the place, from

1) W. A. Schilling, *de collegiis opificum*, 1744.

time immemorial maintained a certain and fixed number of persons.' As the legal basis of these "societies" the author points out the *Jus Civile*, the *Jura Saxonica*, the Saxon Police Regulations, local laws and customs. *Ex quibus facile colligitur*, he continues, *collegiorum societatem non ex privata conjunctione constare posse, sed summae majestatis Magistratus auctoritatem atque confirmationem insuper requiri*; i. e., "Whence it may be easily gathered that the fellowship of the guilds can not exist by private banding together, but requires the authority and confirmation of the supreme majesty of the government." In this way a legal monopoly was created. *Cum ergo*, says our author, *certa Collegia superiorum consensu constituantur, ex eo sequitur, quod aliis extra illud Collegium ejus artis exercitium exercere interdicatur, cum libertas opificiorum per Constitutionem Collegii restringatur*; i. e., "Hence, whereas certain sodalities are established with the consent of the superiors, it follows therefrom that others outside of that sodality are prohibited from the exercise of that trade, since the freedom of trades is restricted by the Constitution of the Sodality." Provision was also made for the pereemptory settlement of difficulties arising between the masters and their employees. *Discipuli saepissime ex injustissimis postulationibus Magistris suis se opponunt et labores sibi demandatos negligunt. Sie stehn in dem Handwerck auf und begehren ihren Meistern, wenn ihnen nicht gewillfahret wird, nicht zu arbeiten. Hoc loco crudelius videretur omnes statim plecti, proinde consultius est, Duces potius et factionis capita seu Antesignanos carcere vel alio modo coercere, ad hoc, ut poena ad paucos, metus ad omnes perveniat. Reliqui vero saltem ad obedientiam Magistris suis praestandam serio admonentur, qui si in contumacia perseverent, poenis debitibus ad id coercentur*; i. e., "The disciples very frequently set themselves against their masters with most unjust demands and neglect the work required of them. They strike in the trade and refuse to work for their masters if their

terms are not granted. In such cases it would seem rather cruel that all should be punished at once; it is better policy to coerce by imprisonment or otherwise the leaders and heads or bannerbearers of the faction, so that the punishment may come upon the few, the fear upon all. The rest are only to be earnestly admonished to render obedience to their masters; but if they remain obstinate, they are coerced by the punishment they deserve.”

This mediaeval system of industrial organization was swept away by a series of social movements and concomitant theories. In France, the liberalistic policy laid out by Quesnay, Gournay and others, and converted into practice chiefly by Turgot, did away with commercial and industrial barriers, trades guilds and market privileges, and introduced freedom of commerce, freedom of trade, freedom of movement, in short, *free competition*. In the same year in which Turgot was, under the stress of monopolistic opposition, dismissed by the king, 1776, Adam Smith, a Scotchman who had studied theology and philosophy and lectured on belles lettres, logic and moral philosophy at Edinburg and Glasgow, published the ripe fruit of his personal intercourse with the French physiocrats and ten years of application to his subject. This work on *the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, one of the most influential books ever written, opens with the words:—

“The annual labor of every nation is the fund which originally supplies it with all the necessaries or conveniences of life which it annually consumes, and which consist always either in the immediate produce of that labor, or in what is purchased with that produce from other nations. According, therefore, as this produce, or what is purchased with it, bears a greater or smaller proportion to the number of those who are to consume it, the nation will be better or worse supplied with all the necessaries and conveniences for which it has occasion.”¹⁾

1) Works of Adam Smith, vol. II, p. 1.

While Smith and the Physiocrats agree in the principle of free competition, they differ as to the sources of wealth, the Physiocrats holding that all wealth is derived from nature, and Smith maintaining that labor is the creator of all wealth. From this principle, Smith argues that, since every man is the best judge of his own interests, the production of wealth will be most effectively promoted by the greatest freedom of industrial pursuits. According to this theory the organization of industrial life was reconstructed in England and on the continent, until the monopolistic barriers had mostly disappeared and free competition had taken their place.

For a time it seemed that the true highway of prosperity had really been discovered. The wealth of nations was marvelously increased in the new industrial era, and all might have gone well if it had not been for several grievous mistakes which clamored for correction. In the first place, labor persistently refused to be the creator of all wealth. No amount of labor could create coal out of nothing; access to the coal beds in the earth was indispeusable, and the mines were not in possession of the laborers. Labor, to be most highly productive, was in need of capital, and capital was largely in other hands than those of the laborers. At the same time it became apparent that if the laborers were the best judges of their own interests, the possessors of land and capital considered themselves the best judges of theirs, and that free competition, to be really free, must work, and actually worked, both ways. Adam Smith himself was by no means blind to this, and even in his great fundamental work he had said, "What are the common wages of labor, depends everywhere upon the contract usually made between those two parties, whose interests are by no means the same. The workmen desire to get as much, the masters to give as little as possible. The former are disposed to combine in order to raise, the latter in order to lower the wages of labor. It is not, however, difficult to foresee which of the

two parties must, upon all ordinary occasions, have the advantage in the dispute, and force the other into a compliance with their terms.”¹⁾

In these words, Adam Smith was the prophet of the Industrialism of which he was the chief apostle and evangelist. He foresees “two parties” in “dispute,” the one party endeavoring to “force” the other into “compliance with their terms.” This was inevitably the outcome of a system based upon and actuated by a fundamental sin, the sin of selfishness whereby man makes his own interests the standard of his actions and conduct. And when this fundamental sin is wedded to a fundamental falsehood as that of labor being the creator of all wealth, what will the offspring be? Thus what was planned as wholesome competition has developed into a contest of conflicting interests, a war of contending parties.

This contest was immensely sharpened and intensified by a change in the methods of industrial production which neither Adam Smith nor any one else had foreseen and taken into consideration, the extensive introduction of labor saving machinery. This affected the condition of laboring men in various ways, most of which do not immediately concern us here. But one of the features of this new order of things is that, while formerly the weaver and the shoemaker and many others worked with their own tools and implements and capital and labor were largely in the same hands, the cost of a modern manufacturing plant with its expensive machinery vastly exceeds the means of by far the greater number of laboring men, few of whom also possess the talent, training and experience for conducting an industrial enterprise on a large scale, and, consequently, the capital and labor engaged in modern manufacturing industries are, as a rule, in different hands. One party, the employer, furnishes, holds and controls the capital; the

1) Works, vol. II, pp. 99 f.

other party, comprising the employees, furnishes the greater part of the manual labor requisite to render capital productive. And while these parties are interdependent upon each other, they are at the same time competing parties, competing for their respective shares in the product, which is the joint product of concurrent causes. While the two parties have, or ought to have, a common interest in the production of wealth, they have conflicting interests as regards the distribution of the wealth produced. The share which goes to the employee as wages cannot at the same time remain the property of the employer, and that part which the employer retains for himself cannot at the same time pass over to the employee. Under the mediaeval system as regulated by law and custom, the distribution was not subject to a conflict between the parties, but to the established rule. But free competition on the principle that every man is the best judge of his own interests leaves the parties to settle the question between themselves, each looking to his own interest and endeavoring to wrest from the other as much as he can. This is one of the motives which leads employees to band together as individuals with a common party interest against the other party, that of employers. Says Trant, "Not only, then, is a union able to bring about a rise in wages sooner than would otherwise be the case, but it is also able to wrest from the masters a larger share of the profits than they would concede to a request unsupported by the power to enforce it."¹⁾ And, on the other hand, it is not entirely without foundation in fact when the same author, speaking of the policy of employers, though in too sweeping a way, says, "Their chief advice to the masters is, 'Be kind to your men;' and to the men, 'Trust to the generosity of your employers.' The men, unfortunately, have had a bitter experience of the generosity from which they are told to expect such great blessings. . . . It is in-

1) *Trade Unions*, p. 76.

deed foolish to maintain that masters would give the full wages to which men are entitled unless they were forced to do so. As a matter of fact they have never done so.¹⁾ Here we have, again, the animus that pervades the industrial classes or parties of to-day. If charity prevailed, the distribution of the emoluments of production would be reached by way of amicable agreement adjusted to the circumstances of the case, and free competition would afford both parties the advantage of free scope for considerate adjustment. But it is not in depraved human nature to be charitable. Natural man is selfish, and free competition in the pursuit of his own interests signifies to him unrestricted license to fight every one whose interests clash with his own. And now labor is or considers itself in competition, free competition with capital for the share it claims in the output of industry. What share? In 1875 the Massachusetts Labor Reform Convention adopted the resolution:—"We affirm, as a fundamental principle, that labor, the creator of all wealth, is entitled to all it creates." The right to the whole produce is what labor to-day claims in its competition with capital. And this is only consistent with the views of the liberal school of political economy which inaugurated the system of free competition. Chapter VIII of Smith's *Wealth of Nations* begins, "The produce of labor constitutes the natural recompense or wages of labor."²⁾ Capital itself, according to Smith, is only the accumulated product of labor. Hence the animosity with which the competition between employees and employers is conducted. Trade unions are conceived and announced as consociations of laboring men for the protection and defense of Labor against the greed and selfishness of Capital³⁾ and the wrongs

1) *Ibid.* pp. 76 f.

2) Smith, *Works*, vol. II, p. 96.

3) It may be proper to explain that when speaking of *Labor* and *Capital* personified, we accommodate ourselves to the modern *usus loquendi*, according to which *Labor* stands for the employees of the industrial *entrepreneur*, who manages and controls the capital invested in the industrial enter-

inflicted upon the former by the latter. The Preamble of the Constitution of the Iron Molders' Union of North America adopted in 1886 opened with the quotation:—

"Labor has no protection—the weak are devoured by the strong. All wealth and all power center in the hands of the few, and the many are their victims and their bondsmen." The Preamble further says:—

"WEALTH IS POWER,¹⁾ and practical experience teaches us that it is a power but too often used to oppress and degrade the daily laborer. Year after year the capital of the country becomes more concentrated in the hands of a few; and in proportion as the wealth of the country becomes more centralized, its power increases, and the laboring classes are impoverished. It therefore becomes us, as men who have to battle with the stern realities of life, to look this matter fairly in the face. There is no dodging the question; let every man give it a fair, full and candid consideration, and then act according to his honest convictions. *What position are we, the mechanics of America to hold in society?*²⁾ Are we to receive an equivalent for our labor sufficient to maintain us in comparative independence and respectability, to procure the means with which to educate our children, and to qualify them to play their part in the world's drama, or must we be forced to bow the suppliant knee to wealth, and earn, by unprofitable toil, a life too void of solace to confirm the very chains that bind us to our doom?

prise, provides the materials and means of production and disposes of the produce to the dealer or consumer, and is, in this relation, known as *Capital*. The *entrepreneur*, or captain of industry, may or may not be the owner of the values invested; he may work wholly or in part with other people's capital. In the distribution of the produce, the part which goes to Labor is *wages*, the part which goes to the owners of the values invested is *interest* or *rent*, and that part which is retained by the *entrepreneur* as such is his *profit*.

1) Capitals of the original.

2) Italics of the original.

"IN UNION THERE IS STRENGTH,¹⁾ and in the formation of an organization embracing every molder in North America, a Union founded upon a basis as broad as the land in which we live, lies our only hope. Single handed, we can accomplish nothing; but united, there is no power of wrong we may not openly defy."

The same spirit of defiance directed against wrongs inflicted by Wealth or Capital upon Labor is manifest throughout the labor movement of our day. Two more illustrations may serve to exemplify the genus. The Preamble of the Constitution adopted by the Cigar Makers' International Union of America in 1885 says:—

"Labor has no protection—the weak are devoured by the strong. All wealth and power center in the hands of the few, and the many are their victims and bondsmen. In all countries and at all times capital has been used to monopolize particular branches of business until the vast and various industrial pursuits of the world are rapidly coming under the immediate control of a comparatively small portion of mankind, tending if not checked by the toiling millions, to enslave or impoverish them.

"Labor is the creator of all wealth, and as such the laborer is entitled to a remuneration sufficient to enable himself and family to enjoy more of the leisure that rightfully belongs to him, more social advantages, more of the benefits, privileges and emoluments of the world; in a word, all those rights and privileges necessary to make him capable of enjoying, appreciating, defending and perpetuating the blessings of modern civilization. Past experience teaches us that labor has so far been unable to arrest the encroachments of capital, neither has it been able to obtain justice from the law-making power. This is due to a lack of practical organization and unity of action. 'In union there is strength.' Organization and united action are the only means

1) Capitals of the original.

by which the laboring classes can gain any advantages for themselves. Good and strong labor organizations are enabled to defend and preserve the interests of the working people."

The Bricklayers' and Masons' International Union of America, in the Preamble of its Constitution adopted in 1893, says:—

"At no period of the world's history has the necessity of combination on the part of labor become so apparent to every thinking mind as at the present time; and, perhaps in no country have the working classes been so forgetful of their own interest as in this great Republic; all other questions seem to attract the attention of the Workingman more than that which is most vital to his existence.

"Whereas, Capital has assumed to itself the right to own and control labor for the accomplishment of its own greedy and selfish ends, regardless of the laws of Nature and Nature's God; and

"Whereas, Experience has demonstrated the utility of concentrated efforts in arriving at specific ends, and it is an evident fact that, if the dignity of labor is to be preserved, it must be done by our united action; and

"Whereas, Believing the truth of the following maxims, that they who would be free themselves must strike the blow, that in Union there is strength, and self-preservation is the first law of nature," etc.

It is but consistent that organizations avowedly formed for such reasons and purposes should treat those who hold the control of capital as their natural and irreconcilable enemies, against whom they must stand arrayed on the basis of "the first law of nature," in the performance of solemn duties toward their families and fellow laborers, in defense of their sacred rights against those who would enslave and otherwise wrong them "for the accomplishment of their greedy and selfish ends, regardless of the laws of Nature and Nature's God." The more consistently organizations

so planned and constituted adhere to and execute their purpose of antagonizing the power of Capital as the oppressor of Labor, the creator of all wealth, the more will their methods and measures, considered as necessary means to their ends, appear justified in the eyes of their members. And yet it is evident that the trend and scope of Trade-Unionism as it is exhibited in the official utterances above quoted, and strikes and boycotts as coercive measures, while in full keeping with one another, are thoroughly and radically immoral, utterly disregarding every principle of charity, the fundamental duty underlying all the legitimate relations between man and man. Even if all the claims of Labor against Capital were just, it would be immoral for the claimants to say to the other party: "Give us what we demand, or we will damage or ruin you." No man is free to be plaintiff, judge, and executioner at the same time concerning matters at issue between himself and another man. No man may arrogate to himself the right of taking the law in his own hands, where there are powers ordained of God to administer law and justice. It has been said that a man may work when he pleases and for whom he pleases, and with considerable limitation this may be conceded. But when a man or a hundred men quit work and keep others from work for the purpose of damaging the employer and thereby coercing him into compliance with their demands, they are *pro tanto* anarchists, even when their claims are in themselves just and ought to be granted. And no strike is considered expedient which does not coerce by taking the opponent at a disadvantage and threatening or inflicting damage to forego which the recalcitrant party is apt to yield. Of course, this is not free competition; for freedom is not license to benefit one's self by harming everybody else, and where coercion begins, free competition is at an end. In free competition every competitor must respect the rights of all other competitors, and my right must cease where my neighbor's right begins. But it is no man's right to force

his will upon any other man. Duress is not a right, but a wrong. God alone and those who act under divine authority may subject my will to theirs and enforce their rulings in spite of what I may will, say, or do. Within the province of free competition it is proper that the best should prevail because it is best, but not that the strongest should prevail because it is strongest. Free competition as such must be determined by right, not by might.

But not by right alone. Right and justice go a great way toward regulating the common affairs of men; but they do not go all the way. Human law and human justice and its administration are, as all things human, imperfect in various ways. Many complications of human affairs are utterly beyond human analysis and adequate adjudication. It is impossible to determine what share of the wealth produced by a multitude of concurrent agencies and causes should fall to an individual workman as his share in proportion to what he has contributed toward the complicated process of its production. It is utterly impossible to state in dollars and cents how much of a year's profit in a great shoe factory is due to the labor of the employees, how much to the management of the employer, and how much to a score or a hundred of other concurrent causes, as the labor and management in other shoe factories, the labor and management of so many tanneries, the amount of cattle raised in this country and abroad, the amount of corn reaped in two hemispheres, the severity of the winter and the amount of rain in the summer, the rates of shipment by land and water, the hundreds of causes which determine the price of coal, changes of fashion, the political outlook, the money market and the innumerable causes by which it is affected, the introduction of new machinery, *et cetera*. How much did John Jones in the packing room and Annie Sloan at one of the stitching machines contribute toward the year's profit of the factory, which cannot even be precisely computed because of the wear and tear of the plant, and what would

be the just recompense of John Jones and Annie Sloan? The whole produce? Perhaps not. For Anderson, the teamster, and Miss Miller, the typewriter girl, want their shares. What shares? Can they tell? Can the Union tell? Can anybody tell?

Here again, apparently, free competition comes to the rescue. If Anderson were the only teamster and Miss Miller the only typewriter girl to be had, they might dictate their terms. But now they have competitors, other men and women who are able and willing to perform the same work, and as they too are free to offer their services, and the employers are free to accept them, the wages question is easily settled. The employers will engage the competitors who will give them the best service for the least wages. If free competition pure and simple is to prevail, then the employer will dismiss Anderson and Miss Miller and employ others in their places, if others will give them the same service for lower wages. But Anderson has a wife and six children to care for, and Miss Miller is the only support of an invalid mother and a consumptive brother. Charitable consideration would, of course, recommend that they be retained in their positions even at higher wages than those for which their competitors, a single man and an unencumbered girl, would be willing to fill their places. The same charitable considerations might have induced these competitors to stand back and even refuse to take the places of the needy incumbents of the positions they might otherwise have sought to obtain or accepted if they had been offered. It is a pleasure to say that instances of such generous use of the privilege of free competition are not entirely unheard of. Individual employers and even so-called soulless corporations are known thus to discriminate, even at a sacrifice of services or wages, in favor of employees whom charitable regards recommend for continued employment. As a rule, however, competition works the other way. Employers will engage Labor at the lowest terms obtainable, and Labor will

compete with Labor regardless of the condition of those whom competition crowds to where they can no longer keep the wolf from their door. Not the laborer, the person, with his human personality, his individual wants and duties, but labor, the thing, is in the market, which is regulated by the law of supply and demand. Where and when the supply is scanty and the demand is high, the price is correspondingly high. Where the supply is plentiful and the demand is small, the price is proportionally low. And where there is no demand, the supply is wanted at no price at all. In these respects, the labor market is as any other market. Here, as elsewhere, neither supply nor demand is a fixed quantity, but both are variable and fluctuating. There is no uniform standard by which they may be gauged. Even the minimum rate at which the laborer can work, the means of bare subsistence, the wage rate to which, according to what has been termed the "iron wage law," free competition must ultimately reduce the laborer, is not a fixed, invariable quantity. For one man requires more food than another; on what an Irishman will starve may suffice to fatten a Chinaman. And as "subsistence" includes the support of the laborer's family, it does not signify the same to a father of seven children and to a single man. Subsistence means more in winter, when fuel and warm clothing are requisite, than in summer, when both are of little account. Here, again, there would be a wide field for charitable adjustment in the economy of free competition, providing from the produce of industrial pursuits under the blessing of God not only the necessaries, but also a fair allowance of comfort, for all the members of an industrial community. But such a condition of things will and can never obtain under a system of free competition in a selfish world, even with the best administration of human justice within the reach of deteriorated human nature.

To sum up: what might have been *a priori* concluded, has been *a posteriori* amply demonstrated, that an indus-

trial system of free competition in this world of sin and selfishness is and must be a failure. Not, indeed, a failure in every respect; for free competition is very apt to work as a powerful stimulus for energetic exertion of the faculties and powers of body and mind, and may engender, as it has undoubtedly done, vastly increased activity in the various pursuits of industrial life. But a failure as far as the true temporal happiness of human society and its members is concerned. "The modern man," says Prof. Ely, "like the modern trotter, has been developed in the race-course. Every one must be active and alert or suffer loss. Progress in technical processes has been rapid, and the formation of new enterprises has been encouraged.... When we come to speak of the disadvantages of the modern system of freedom, that is to say, of competition, it occurs to us that the moral atmosphere of the race-course is not a wholesome one. Competition tends to force the level of economic life down to the moral standard of the worst men who can sustain themselves in the business community."¹⁾

All this is by no means of recent discovery. On the contrary, the world is, and has been for many years, full of those who exert their utmost endeavors to put down this very thing, once preached as a gospel of social salvation by wise men and hailed with shouts of joy by other wise men and ignorant multitudes, free competition. Trade Unions, Communism, Socialism, Trusts, Monopolism in a hundred forms, are so many physicians endeavoring, each in his way, to cure society of this organic disease, free competition, and the long catalogue of evils resulting therefrom.

Trade Unions, as has been shown, are, in one way, conceived and operated as means of more successful competition with Capital for the share of Labor in the distribution of the produce of industry. But Labor has learned by experience that, while this competition is *free* competi-

1) Introd. to Pol. Econ., p. 83.

tion, Capital is as free to employ whom it pleases as Labor is to work for whom it pleases, and that, if the labor market is a free market, Capital must be as free to purchase labor as cheap as it can, if Labor is free to sell its services as high as it can. And Labor, furthermore, learned by experience, that, while Capital and Labor are interdependent as far as production is concerned, Labor is at a disadvantage when both become unproductive. For idleness soon entails want to the average laborer, while Capital, as a rule, can wait and bide its time, especially when production has been abundant. The only thing which might have done away with this disadvantage of Labor, charity, was, as experience also painfully demonstrated, a rare bird on both sides, and Capital, on the contrary, openly figured on the wolf on the other side and computed the time when want would bring Labor to terms.

In this plight, Labor saw no recourse but simply to restrict the freedom of its competitors, to dictate its terms and coerce its competitors to accept them. Under the sway of Trade Unions, a manufacturing firm is no longer in free control of its business and of the capital invested. When the Union determines what wages shall be paid, how many hours the machinery shall run, what material shall or shall not be used, who shall or shall not work, to whom the output shall or shall not be sold, by whom it shall or shall not be shipped, it is, *pro tanto*, Labor, not Capital, which controls the works and the production and distribution of the produce. Mr. Connolly's answer before the Royal Commission, "We do not take masters into account at all in our arrangements,"¹⁾ tersely and clearly states the point in the case. To make this point, the organization of Labor was requisite. "In union there is strength," the strength required to bring Capital to terms, "to wrest from the masters a larger share of the profits

1) Q. 1349. See QUARTERLY, present Vol., p. 99.

than they would concede to a request unsupported by the power to enforce it."¹⁾ "Organization and united action are the only means by which the laboring classes can gain any advantages to themselves. Good and strong labor organizations are enabled to defend and preserve the interests of the working people."²⁾ Control implies the power to control, and since Labor has learned that, in order to wrest from the masters a larger share of the produce, it must wrest from the employer the control of production and the means of production, organization for this purpose is a matter of course. Hence the efforts of organized Labor to strengthen its ranks and the animosity of Unions toward the "scabs" who stand aloof and refuse to join in the endeavors which alone can secure success.

But this refusal to co-operate is not the "scab's" only sin. He appears also as the competitor of organized Labor, in times of peace and, especially, in times of war. While the competition of laboring men among themselves is free, when every man may determine for himself at what price he would work, regardless of the prices dictated by the Union, Capital is to the same extent free to employ Labor at the terms agreed upon between the contracting parties, both parties being, as they should be under the law of contracts, free to offer and accept the terms of the contract by which they would mutually stand. But this freedom of competition, as we have seen, does not work to universal satisfaction. Especially does it seriously interfere with certain measures of organized labor. If, in case of a strike, competing labor steps into the vacant places and remains there, the strike will result in a twofold failure: the employers will not be coerced, and the strikers, instead of securing a gain, will sustain a loss, the loss of their positions with all their emoluments. Hence this free compe-

1) Trant, *Trade Unions*, p. 76.

2) Constitution of the Cigar Makers' Intern. Union.

tition must cease. In the Preamble of its Constitution, the Building Trades' Council of St. Louis and Vicinity said:—

"It is furthermore agreed, that to protect our organizations from the destructive influence of non-union men, we shall not work with non-union men of any trade, when such trade is represented in this Council; neither shall we work on buildings where non-union men have been employed regardless of the protest of this Council." Of course, when these organizations say, "We will not work with non-union men," the true meaning is, "Non-union men shall not work with us." The free laborer shall either become a member of the Union and thus step out of free competition with the Union men; or he shall be shut out of all competition, free or unfree, by being denied the privilege of working at any trade represented in the Labor-organization. What will become of him in the latter event, does not concern the Union men. If he can find work by which he does not compete with them, let him. If he can not, and must suffer want in consequence, let him. Perhaps want will change his mind and drive him into the Union, where he ought to have been long ago. To join the Union is, in fact, looked upon as a social duty, the neglect of which should bring suffering upon the delinquent. Says an English Member of Parliament:—

"Looked at from its purely social aspects, much can be urged in favor of the utmost pressure being applied to induce workmen to belong to the Union. Those who persistently remain outside, neglect an obvious duty—the duty of manfully doing their part to keep the current rates of wages, and maintain a maximum working-day. Non-Unionists are always ready to take advantage of the fruits of others' labors; they ought to partake of some share in sowing the seed, tilling the ground, and promoting the growth and maturity of the harvest, as well as reaping and gathering it in."¹⁾

1) G. Howell, M. P., *Trade Unionism New and Old*, pp. 83 f.

That organized Labor has not been more successful in securing the control of industry is, and with some truth, charged to unorganized Labor. We have heard Sir William Erle say that "the action of unions, so far as it excludes non-unionists from work, and requires for unionists wages to a certain amount, is founded on a supposed monopoly of a given kind of work in a given district. All such work is assumed to be the property of the union; if all the workmen who can supply the work are in the union, the monopoly is secured."¹⁾ But, as a matter of fact, this retrogression from liberalism to monopolism is far from being complete. To this day, by far the greater part of Labor is unorganized. There are great industrial communities with thousands of skilled and unskilled laborers employed by powerful corporations, where no Labor Union exists and all efforts to organize Labor have been rejected by the men. Nor has Trade Unionism done by far as much as some people think toward securing for labor a greater share of the produce. That strikes have caused immense losses to Labor is conceded on all sides. But it is not equally well established that these losses have been balanced by corresponding gains. It has been said that, while the losses were temporary and local, the gains in the form of increased wages have been permanent and general, and that, consequently, strikes have raised the rate of wages and improved the condition of Labor. But this argument contains a *petitio principii*. It is by no means proved that the increase of wages following strikes has been the effect of the strikes. We quote from an authority of high standing:—

"It is altogether a different matter to infer that because increased wages have been attained the strikes are the cause of attainment. This argument is essentially one of the kind *post hoc, ergo propter hoc*—a kind of argument more often fallacious than sound. We must remember that many other

1) See *ante*, p. 100.

causes have been in operation tending towards the increase of earnings. . . . In view of this multiplicity of causes, in fact, the method of direct experience fails.

"The last chance of a verdict conclusively in favor of strikes is removed when we remember that the general rise of wages allowed by statists to have occurred is by no means confined to trades which are united and addicted to striking, but extends more or less distinctly to all classes of employees. Many extensive groups of workers, such as mercantile and bank clerks, Government clerks and officials, post-office employees, policemen, soldiers, and so forth, have all attained distinct and, what is more, permanent advances of salary, without anything to be called striking. Still more remarkably is this the case with domestic servants, an exceedingly numerous class of persons, quite devoid of organization, and often of an age and character little suited, it might be thought, to enforce concession. Yet, by the natural operation of the laws of supply and demand, and by their own good sense, these employees have been greatly advanced in earnings and other advantages. . . .

"So difficult, or rather impossible, is it to distinguish the cases in which strikes must inflict great loss and disappointment and those in which they may yield at least apparent success, that the economist incurs grave responsibility in expressing approval of any strikes."¹⁾

Even so strong an advocate of Trade-Unionism as Trant says, "A trade society may retard a fall or accelerate a rise (of wages), but it cannot change the law that regulates the fluctuations, or render permanent that which in its very essence is temporary."²⁾

To sum up again: free competition as a golden highway to human happiness has proved a failure. And the

1) W. Stanley Jevons, LL. D., F. R. S., *The State in Relation to Labor.*
3d. ed., pp. 120—122.

2) *Trade Unions*, p. 141.

endeavors of Trade Unions to put down free competition between Capital and Labor and between Labor and Labor, and thus to enhance the condition and secure the welfare of the laboring classes have also proved a failure.

And now let us consider, for a moment, at what a fearful price this failure has been bought. We will not here dwell with any length on the thousands and millions of dollars paid from the wages of laborers into the treasuries of Trade Unions and largely disbursed in industrial warfare of, to say the least, doubtful expediency. Far heavier than this expenditure is the appalling encumbrance of sin and crime with which Trade Unionism is loaded down in the sight of God and man. Millions upon millions of dollars' worth of property, other people's property, deliberately destroyed. Thousands of lives brought to a violent end. Thousands of widows and orphans deprived of their husbands and fathers. Thousands of laborers and their families reduced to utmost misery. Fathers and sons and brothers and fellow church-members forced to wage war upon each other as employers and employees, sons constrained to strike against their fathers, and fellow Christians to oust fellow Christians from employment and thus reduce them and their families to penury. Hatred and bitter enmity engendered between those who should have been encompassed with bonds of love and good fellowship. Open defiance of law and order and conflicts with municipal, state and national governments and their officers. Untold acts of ingratitude and injustice enjoined by the rules and resolutions of Unions and Federations or their councils and officers and walking delegates. And all this in the face of the divine law and precept, **THOU SHALT LOVE THY NEIGHBOR AS THYSELF!** Such is the burden of sin and guilt for which Trade Unionism will have to answer on the day of reckoning. Should any Christian be willing to share that guilt? And should any Christian pastor refuse or neglect to warn his people and open their eyes to these unfruitful works of darkness,

lest they fellowship with these things, because of which the wrath of God will surely come upon the children of disobedience?¹⁾

In the performance of this duty we may, of course, expect to meet with various objections.

There may be those who will tell us that it is their business and not ours to determine their course in the management of their temporal affairs. To such we should say that to determine what is right or wrong in all their affairs is neither their business nor ours, but God's, who has reserved to himself the right of determining what is sin and what is righteousness, and that it is our business to inculcate the will of God upon all those whose souls God has committed to our care,²⁾ and that it is their business and duty to hear us and to prove what is acceptable to the Lord.³⁾

Others may tell us that, since their occupation places them in the ranks of the industrial army, they are bound to conform with the rules and regulations prevailing in the world of labor; that Trade Unions have come to be a part of the industrial system of our day, recognized and legalized by civil legislation, and that the individual must simply accommodate himself to the prevailing state of things. To these we should say that all the rules and regulations and all legislative enactments in the world cannot rescind a single commandment of God; that many divorces legalized by the law of the state are damnable sins in the sight of God; that many of the measures of the Unions are violations even of the secular law; and that where they are not, it still behooves a Christian not to be conformed to this world in its sinful ways, but in all things to prove what is the good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God.⁴⁾

1) Eph. 5, 6 ff. Ezek. 3, 17—21.

2) Ezek. 3, 17. Acts 20, 28. Hebr. 13, 17.

3) Eph. 5, 10. 17. Rom. 12, 2.

4) Rom. 12, 2. 1 Pet. 4, 4.

Still others have objected that, unless they join the Union, they cannot obtain work, and that, since it is their duty to support their families, they must be with the union, though they would gladly be without it. These should be encouraged to seek employment where organized labor will not or cannot interfere, either in their trade or out of it, at the place of their present abode or at another place, in the country, if they fail to succeed in the city, trusting that he that is in us is greater than he that is in the world,¹⁾ and that the Lord will provide, and not leave them, nor forsake them.²⁾ To such brethren the pastor and all the members of the congregation should extend a helping hand, that by their active assistance the conscientious brother may find the fulfillment of his daily prayer and petition, *Give us this day our daily bread.* And here a duty devolves upon those members of our congregations who are employers of Labor, a duty of which they should be earnestly reminded by the pastor. A Christian employer should be led to look upon himself as a steward of the Lord who, by his apostle, has said, *As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith.*³⁾ If he must discriminate, it should be done, not against, but for, his brother in Christ as long as his hand is free thus to discriminate.

But what is the pastor to do if his warnings and admonitions are left unheeded? What will a physician do when he finds that the medicine he prescribed at his first call has not had the desired effect? Will he leave his patient to his fate? No; he will sit down and write another prescription, taking into account any new symptoms, especially if they indicate the necessity of a more energetic treatment. Nor will he after a third or fourth call abandon his patient. The time may come when he will seek a consultation with another practitioner, or recommend that a trained nurse should

1) 1 John 4, 4.

2) Hebr. 13, 5.

3) Gal. 6, 10.

be employed. Thus he will continue to fight the malady and persist in his efforts to save the life he sees endangered, until his endeavors are crowned with success and the patient has recovered, or the disease has terminated in death and all that remains to be done is to pronounce life extinct. Let the faithful pastor go and do likewise. Let him administer to his patient in the Labor Question ward the remedy by which alone he may be healed; let him continue while there are still tokens of spiritual life; let him call in all the assistance available. The day may come when he and his assistants and the patient himself may rejoice in a successful cure. Or the day may come when sin may have resulted in spiritual death and he who was once a Christian must be pronounced a heathen man and a publican. A. G.

OUTLINES OF FUNERAL SERMONS.

At the Funeral of a Little Child.

On John 3, 16.

The Lord gave you this dear little child, and the Lord hath taken it away. Job 1, 21. Or can we imagine that our beloved children fall into their graves without God's notice, will, or interposition? Did some malicious hand stop up the avenues of life, and break its springs, so as to baffle all the parents' tenderness, and all of the physician's skill? By no means! It was the Lord. It has pleased the Lord in His good and wise providence to take from this vale of tears the soul of your dearly beloved child. Matt. 10, 29, 30. Acts 17, 27, 28. Job 1, 21.

WHAT INDUCED GOD TO TAKE TO HIMSELF THIS LITTLE CHILD IN ITS EARLY INFANCY?

I.

His divine love toward this little child.

a. He, out of divine love, "gave His only begotten Son" for it ("the world") into sufferings and death, in

order that it "should not perish," should not be eternally lost and condemned, "but have everlasting life," bliss, or happiness. Col. 1, 12—14.

b. By Holy Baptism the Holy Ghost made all the above mentioned benefits, which Christ obtained by His suffering and death, its own. Mark 16, 16. (Synod. Catechism, Q. 282 and 285.) By its baptism, God graciously delivered this little child from sin, death and the devil, and rendered it an heir of eternal salvation.

c. He graciously delivered it from every evil of body and soul. α . Evil of the body: sickness, pain, hunger, want, etc. β . Evil of the soul: everything that injures the soul, sin, the malice of the devil, despair, eternal damnation, etc.

d. He graciously took it to Himself in heaven. Rev. 14, 13. Ps. 16, 6. Acts 2, 29. Job 1, 21. Should not perish, but have everlasting life. Mark 10, 13—15. (Sweet consolation.)—Jer. 31, 3.

II.

His divine love toward you, the parents.

a. God loves you likewise. Notice the greatness of God's love to you. God loved you so that He gave His only begotten Son for you. Notice the glorious purpose of God's love. You should not perish; you should not be cast away; should not be lost; should not be condemned.—But you should have everlasting life, everlasting joy and happiness. Notice the divinely appointed mode by which you are to obtain the benefits of this glorious purpose. *Whosoever believeth in Him.* Acts 4, 12. Rom. 1, 16. Mark 16, 16.

b. God manifested His love to you in this present circumstance by the removal of this your beloved child. God would thereby teach you a lesson concerning the things of this world. 1 John 2, 15—17. You should not put your trust in these things, not love them more than the Lord. Matt. 10, 37. Jer. 17, 5. Prov. 3, 5. Ps. 118, 8, 9. He

would teach you to seek the kingdom of God. Matt. 6, 33. 34. Phil. 3, 13. 14. Matt. 16, 26.—Hebr. 13, 14. He would teach you to number your days. Ps. 90, 12. Luke 12, 40. Matt. 24, 42. Lord,

Teach me to ponder oft my end,
And, ere the hour of death appears,
To cast my soul on Christ, its Friend,
Nor spare repentant sighs and tears;
My God, for Jesus' sake I pray,
Thy peace may bless my dying day.

Amen.

J. C. A.

At the Funeral of an Adult Christian.

On 1 Tim. 4, 8.

These words of St. Paul are often quoted as if they would say that through godliness we might make our fortune here and hereafter, or, that our temporal and eternal happiness were of our own making, or, that by godliness of life we might secure what the world would consider happiness and prosperity. But see Eph. 2, 8. 2 Cor. 8, 9.—Matt. 16, 24. Acts 14, 22.—2 Cor. 1, 6. Hereof our departed friend was an example in his life and death.

OF THE ADVANTAGES OF TRUE GODLINESS.

I.

Let us consider the nature of true godliness.

True godliness comes from God and conducts men to God. God is its Author, the Object, and its End. True godliness always comprises,

a. *the fear of God.* Of the wicked it is affirmed, that "there is no fear of God before their eyes;" they live regardless of their Maker. They "live without God in the world." This is the secret of their unhappiness.—"The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." A man does not even begin to be wise—wise for himself, for time and eternity—till he begins to live in the fear of God.—Not a

slavish fear or terror, but an affectionate, filial fear. Hebr. 2, 15. Rom. 8, 15. Ps. 33, 8.—Gen. 39, 9.

b. *firm trust and confidence in God.* Ps. 42, 11. Ps. 118, 8. Prov. 3, 5.—Jer. 17, 5; the confidence that God is my God, that Jesus is *my* Savior. He loved *me*, and gave Himself for *me*.—John 3, 16.

c. *supreme love toward God.* 1 John 4, 19. 1 Cor. 8, 3. Matt. 22, 37. Ps. 73, 25. 26.

d. *continued intercourse with God.* 1 John 1, 3. Behold the exercises of the man of true godliness, observe his private devotions! Behold him in his perusal of the Holy Bible! Observe him in the house of his God, hearing His holy word, singing His praises! See him in his humble approach to the Lord's Supper! Luke 2, 41 ff. 1 Sam. 1, 7 ff. Ps. 1, 2. Ps. 23, 6.

In one word, true godliness *implies an humble and supreme regard to the honor and glory of God, in all we think, and say, and do.* (Application!)

II.

Let us consider some of its advantages.

“Godliness is profitable unto all things.” It is profitable in all instances and at all seasons. It is profitable while we live, as well when we die. It is profitable for this life, and for that life to come.

a. The promise of godliness for the *present life.* *α.* Consider its influence on a man's external circumstances, in every situation of life. It keeps a man from living in sloth and idleness. It induces a man to become industrious, honest, conscientious, temperate. *β.* Godliness promotes a man's true temporal prosperity. Matt. 6, 33. Ps. 127, 2. Luke 12, 15—21. 1 Pet. 5, 7. *γ.* Godliness has a tendency to prolong life itself. It has the promise of the life that now is. Eph. 6, 3. It is a fact that many diseases which embitter and shorten human life arise from the violation of the rules of godliness. Ps. 34, 21. Ps. 68, 2. “The wicked

shall not live out half their days.'' Godliness lays the most salutary restraints upon a man's passions, and regulates his temper and conduct. Gal. 5, 24. 2 Cor. 5, 17. 1 Tim. 6, 6—10. δ. Godliness is profitable during every stage of life. It is of inestimable advantage in the *morning of life*. It is profitable at the *noon of life*. It is profitable at *life's even-tide*. It is profitable at the close of life. Compare the closing scenes of a godless life, and the closing scenes of a Christian life. Luke 16.

(Application: the life and death of — —!)

b. The promise of godliness for the life to come. That life is eternal, unmarred by sin, 2 Tim. 4, 8. 1 Pet. 1, 4. Hebr. 12, 23, or pain, Is. 25, 8. 35, 10. 60, 20. 49, 10. Rev. 7, 16. 17. 21, 4, or death, Rom. 7, 24. 1 Cor. 15, 26. 54. Rev. 21, 4. 20, 14. Luke 20, 36, or the possibility of apostasy. 1 Thess. 4, 17. Rev. 3, 5. 12. That life is a life of bliss and great glory, Rev. 14, 13. Matt. 13, 43, —and of gracious rewards, Rev. 14, 13. Matt. 10, 42. 2 Cor. 9, 6.

Therefore, be thou faithful unto death, and thou shalt receive a crown of life. Amen. J. C. A.

On Matt. 25, 21.

These words are full of encouragement and comfort to all believers, and may well fill us with wonder and surprise. The best of Christians is a poor frail creature, and needs the blood of the Lamb, the blood of atonement every day he lives. But the least of believers will find that he is counted among Christ's servants, and that his labor has not been in vain in the Lord. 1 Cor. 15, 58.

A SERVANT OF JESUS CHRIST.

I.

Consider *his character*.

a. A good and faithful servant accepts his position as a servant with all that is included in that position. He is not striving for something else.

- b. A good and faithful servant cheerfully bears the labor and burden of his stewardship.
- c. A good and faithful servant renders service with hearty good will.
- d. A good and faithful servant is obedient to his master. His will is in subjection to the will of the Lord.
- e. A good and faithful servant has his master's interest ever before him.
- f. A good and faithful servant is profitable to his master. (Application: character of the departed.)

II.

His commendation and reward.

- a. His commendation: "Well done." α . This is a real commendation, not false, deceitful, delusive; not self-exaltation but approval and recognition from on high, by Him who knows all things, who knoweth them that are His and what is in the hearts of men. β . It is a full and complete commendation; full as to manner and spirit; full as to substance and meaning. What can be added to it?
- b. His reward. The good and faithful servants of Christ shall not be put off with bare words; no, all their work of love shall be graciously rewarded. "Enter thou into the joy of the Lord." The state of the blessed is a state of joy, not only because all tears shall then be wiped away, but all the fountains of comfort and joy shall be opened to them. This joy is the joy of our Lord. The joy and happiness which He Himself has purchased and provided for us; the joy bought with His blood. It is joy in the Lord, who is our exceeding joy! — The good and faithful servants of Jesus Christ shall enter into this joy, shall have a full and complete possession of it. Let us remember this and take courage. Here some drops of joy enter into us, but there we shall enter into joy. Amen. / J. C. A.

TWO SICK-CALLS.

I.

Mr. B., a poor laborer and member of my congregation, called on me and asked me to visit a poor sick woman who was staying at his house and in her agony did not know what to do. Going with him, I learned a sad, sad story. The sick woman, suffering from that terrible disease, cancer, was the wife of a fellow laborer of Mr. B. The husband, who occasionally had visited our church, had needed all his earnings to provide food, fuel and medicine for his poor sick wife, who had been reared in the Roman Catholic church, but for years and years had not attended any church at all. He had no money left to pay his rent. The hard-hearted landlord without mercy had put out the poor man with his sick wife into the street. So Mr. B. and his wife had taken the poor sick woman into their house, and although they were poor themselves and had very little room, they and their children confined themselves to the kitchen and a very small room, giving the best and largest room and the most kind attention to the poor sick woman. This I was told in a very unpretentious, matter of fact, way. To me it was an exemplification of the words, Matt. 25, 35. 36: "I was a stranger, and ye took me in. . . . I was sick, and ye visited me."

When I entered the sick room I beheld an emaciated woman above middle age, bearing the stamp of disease, lying on a bed, her features distorted by pain and deeply furrowed from suffering. Just at that moment she was groaning deeply with pain, so that it was impossible for me to speak to her. Sitting at the bedside I held her hand in mine till she recovered and turned her face to me. I then said to her: "My dear friend, I am very, very sorry to find you so sick and suffering so terribly."

"Yes," she answered, "I am very sick and suffering beyond what words can say. Ah, these pains are very great indeed. But it will not last long any more, I think."

"You mean," I said, "it will not be long before death will come and take you away?"

"Yes," she answered, "I will not be here very long any more. I feel it."

Now is your opportunity, I thought, and I asked the woman, "Well, have you made your peace with God?" At these words her pain-distorted features were stamped with an expression of great agony of soul, and turning her sad eyes away from mine, she spoke in a hopeless tone: "No, no, I have not yet made my peace with God, and at present am too sick to do it. Oh! I am suffering such terrible pains, that I am utterly unable to think of it even for a little while. Oh, no, no, I have not yet made my peace with God!"

And then followed outbursts and abrupt exclamations betraying the false instruction she had received in her youth in the Roman church regarding our redemption and salvation—invocations of the Virgin Mary and the saints interrupted with expressions of utter despair on account of her many, many sins—so that my heart was greatly moved within me. When at last she was silent, with a sigh to God to open the heart of the poor benighted woman, in a friendly and mild way I said to her: "Good woman, I have a good message, glad tidings for you."

"A good message, glad tidings for me?" she retorted quickly. "For me there can not be any good message. What is it?"

"Why, the glad tidings that it is not necessary at all for you now to make your peace with God."

With a quick, eager, longing look she turned to me and said: "What do you say? What do you mean by telling me that it is not necessary for me to make peace with God?"

"I mean to say that God already has made peace with you through and by a certain person, and that I came here for the very purpose of telling you so." "Now, listen," I proceeded, speaking to the eager and intently listening

woman, "you are quite right if you say that you are too sick to make your peace with God. Even if you were quite well you would not be able to do it. But God Himself has done it, He has made peace for you, and He has done this through His only begotten Son Jesus Christ, whom He sent into the world to be the propitiation for our sins." And now I began to tell her in the simplest possible language about the merciful counsel of God regarding our salvation; how God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son; how Jesus, the Son of God, came into this world and took upon Himself our nature without sin; how God had made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we may be made the righteousness of God in Him, and how God cast *all our* sins upon Him; how Christ Jesus was wounded for our transgressions, and was bruised for our iniquities, that the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed. And again, how Christ His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree; how He, the Just One, died for the unjust, in order to bring us to God; that the blood of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, cleanseth us from all sin, and that the Lamb of God taketh away the sin of the world. Then, taking out my New Testament and pointing out Col. 1, 20, I read to her that Christ had made peace for us through the blood of His cross by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself; also Eph. 2, 14—17, pointing to the words, "for He is our peace," "and came and preached peace to you which were afar off," in the Gospel,—and that therefore we were not to work out and merit our peace with God by our own works, contrition, atonement, prayers, or feelings, as Christ long ago had made peace for us through His cross, and that now unconditionally He proclaims and gives that very peace to us, John 14, 27.

"Don't you see, my good woman," I said in conclusion, "what God already has done for you in Christ Jesus? Don't you hear and understand how He tells you: You need not make peace with me, try to reconcile me, but only *believe*,

believe what I have done for you already, and put your trust in that? Believe, oh, believe me, your God assures you, that He has made peace with you through Jesus Christ, that He is reconciled to you already, that sin, death, hell, Satan, have no power over you, but that you are God's own dear child, dearly bought by the blood of His Son."

While I was speaking and reading the Gospel to her, she had been listening with minutest attention and rapt gaze. So greatly was she interested that in spite of her pain she had half raised herself, leaning upon her elbow, resting her face in her hand, apparently snatching every word from my lips. When I had finished speaking, she eagerly said: "Oh, good man, will you please read that to me once more,—those words about the peace?"

Most willingly those passages were read to her again, and again it was explained to her how Jesus already had adjusted her cause, and how utterly worthless everything was in this direction which we would try to undertake. During my last words tears streamed down the deep furrows of her emaciated face. A sweet, calm smile passed over her lips, and, lying down, she time and again repeated the words, "Oh, is not this precious, is it not precious indeed! Oh, what a precious message that the Son of God came into the world and died and made peace for me! Is not this precious, is it not glorious!"

Silently I arose, and left her alone for a while with her Savior, who had won her, and the peace in whom she just now had found.—Having had occasion and the great pleasure to strengthen her faith in her Savior under her trials, I after a few weeks assisted in laying her body into the grave to rise again on the last day to everlasting glory. But very often when gloomy thoughts oppress my heart and soul I repeat the words of that poor and yet so blessed sick woman: "Oh, is it not precious, oh, how precious is this, that the Son of God came into the world and died to make peace for me!"

II.

In quite a different spiritual condition I found a woman to whose sick-bed I was called by Elder D. She had been instructed and confirmed in the Lutheran church by the venerable Pastor B., but, like so many, a few years after her confirmation had quit the church entirely. Afterwards she married a Roman Catholic, had her children baptized in the Catholic church, and lived in constant disharmony, or rather, enmity with her husband, a drunkard and spendthrift. Thirty-three years since her confirmation had passed by; she had been living for years in the house of Elder D., who had been witness to the ungodly, wicked life of the family, but never had the woman shown a disposition to go to church, although Mr. D. had reminded her of her confirmation vow. Now she had been attacked by a horrible disease and had been suffering for weeks. These facts I learned from Mr. D., who had prevailed on the woman to allow him to call his pastor to her sick-bed. On entering the sick-room I perceived at once that there was hardly any chance for Mrs. P. to recover, although she might live a few weeks more. After having expressed to her my sympathy, she herself admitted that she was beyond hope. Now I asked her if she was well prepared to face death and go into eternity, if she knew that her days were numbered; whereupon she said, "Certainly, and I have nothing to fear." Astonished at these words, I asked her why she thought herself well prepared? "Well," she answered, "I don't see that I have done any wrong, I am not bad like a good many hypocrites and church-goers; why, then, should I be afraid to die?" Shuddering at the terrible spiritual blindness of the woman, I told her that death and eternity were not things to be made light of, that the Almighty Lord, knowing even the thoughts of our hearts and all our words and actions, would pass severe and just judgment upon every one. She answered, she need not fear that judgment, she had done no wrong. Now I told

her that the word of God tells us that there is no difference, that all have sinned and come short of the glory of God; that we are dead in trespasses and sins by nature; that the imaginations of our heart are evil from our youth; that we are sinners, born of sinners, and conceived in sin. But it was all in vain. She was not that kind of person she said. I tried to point out to her the wrong she had done by anger and hatred—she never had been angry, never had hated anyone—; by being disobedient to her parents—; she never had been so even in her thoughts, she asserted; by speaking evil of her neighbors—; she never had done anything of that sort; by cursing and using bad language—; she never had done the like; by despising preaching and the word of God—; she never had despised it; circumstances that were a valid excuse had prevented her from going to church, she said, but she nevertheless had read it, certainly kept it in her heart all the while. To be brief, wherever I tried to convince her that she had not kept this or that commandment, and therefore sinned,—she emphatically denied it. She asserted that she perfectly loved God and her neighbor, and had done so as long as she could remember.

Now terror seized me, and I almost despaired of dispelling the fiendish darkness of self-righteousness. Sighing to the Lord to grant His Spirit and power, all at once a thought flashed through my mind. I arose, and standing before the bed and having my eyes sharply fixed upon the patient, I spoke to her: "Woman, during my lifetime and the fulfilling of my office as a minister for many years, I have come across a good many wicked and pertinacious persons; but I must say that I hardly ever have met one who is your equal. You are very wicked indeed. You have, during the last forty minutes been telling me a great number of base, outrageous lies, and you know it. You have been leading a dissipated life, have been quarreling, fighting with your husband, have acted not like a mother but a heartless creature against your children, have abused your neighbors in

the meanest manner, etc., etc., and you still have the brazen face to tell me that you never did any wrong. You know you did, and you lie. But mark, the wrath of the holy and righteous God is upon such wicked people, is upon you, and if you die in this manner your lot will and must be eternal, mark, *eternal punishment, damnation and torment*. He whom you have served and still serve, will give you your wages, the devil, through all eternity; for God says that accursed will be every one who only transgresses one jot of the law. But what curse and wrath will be upon you, having numberless sins upon your conscience! You are a wicked, wicked woman. You do not fear God in the least. Beware of God's wrath." Now, I thought, a decision will come, either she will grow terribly angry at me, and then I can convince her right there that she is a poor sinner, doing sin with her anger, or she will break down and admit and confess. The latter came to pass. After I had been speaking to her in the manner above described for about fifteen minutes, she began to shake and shiver, even so that the bed began to shake, deathly pallor covering her face. After I had finished speaking she lay there for a few minutes pale, motionless, almost breathless, and lisped while torrents of tears streamed down her pallid cheeks, "Yes, pastor, such a horrid, wicked woman I am; and I knew it, my conscience told me, but I did not want to acknowledge it. Oh, mercy, mercy! Is there any help for such a horribly wicked creature as I am? I know I told you lies, lies all the time before,—oh, I am lost, eternally lost!"

But the Spirit of God in the word of the gospel proved stronger than all the power of the arch-enemy to thrust this formerly benighted and self-conceited soul into utter despair. The words, "God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him, should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved;" and, "This is a

faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief," at last brought rest, peace and consolation into the heart awakened from the death of sin. By the grace of the Holy Spirit the poor woman began to pray for mercy; and it was given to her that she could believe. During the next ten days—the last of her earthly life—I had to visit her twice or three times every day. She was eagerly longing every time to hear more, more gospel truth, to be reassured again and again of her salvation through Christ Jesus. Satan tried his very best to pluck faith and trust in Jesus from out of her heart, and bring her to despair, but in vain. Very seldom have I met a person listening so attentively and eagerly to every word read from the Scriptures under such pains as this woman, and very few, if any, have I seen expecting death so serenely, even joyfully as she did when this messenger came to call her hence into the eternal home, though I have stood at the death-beds of many hundreds.

C. L. J.

Theological Review.

Why men do not go to church. By *Cortland Myers, minister at Baptist Temple, Brooklyn, N. Y.* Funk & Wagnalls Company. New York and London. 1899.—148 pp. Price, 60 cents.

We deem it a duty, in the first place, to take exception to the title of this book as far as our German Lutheran churches are concerned. Men do go to church there, and in great numbers, not only in the country, but also in the towns and cities. Most of them have been regular church-goers from their childhood up; most of them remain regular church-goers till they are borne into the church in a coffin and their funeral sermon is preached to a congregation of men and women.

But we have known and written before this that in most of the Anglo-American churches the men are few, deploringly and alarmingly few. Hereof the author of the book before us says:—

"In New York City not more than three per cent. of the male population are members of Protestant churches. The men who are nominally communicants in the Catholic church rarely even attend its services.

"Of the membership of the church nearly three-fourths are women. Of the attendants in most places of worship nine-tenths are women. In one great church I counted two hundred women and ten men. The statement has remained unchallenged that not ten churches in the State of Massachusetts could count ten men added in the last three years from the non-churchgoing population. This is not only true of the cities, but statistics reveal the startling truth that even in the rural districts more than one-half of the population are absolute strangers to the churches, and live in heathenism in the center of civilization and Christianity.

"This separation from the church is not only on the part of the so-called lower class and foreign population, but the rich are among the most guilty."—pp. X f.

Our author also says much that is good and true in explanation of this state of things. He specifies "faults of the church," "faults of the man," and "faults of society," and points out ways and means whereby these faults may be rectified and the evil resulting therefrom may be counteracted. Our readers will appreciate the following specimens of what is, in our estimation, in the main a very creditable treatise on a very important and timely subject.

"The world does not want for preaching, but is sorely in need of the right kind. 'Words, words, words,' without the heartburning purpose to save men, is one of the most impassable barriers before the church door. This wisdom of words has made the cross of Christ of none effect. We are not in need of either brains or money. We are in need of the Gethsemane purpose. To gather a crowd temporarily is not the required success. A crowd may be drawn by a balloon ascension. There have been crowd-compelling, money-gathering Gospel balloons, but the balloon has burst, and the aeronaut has fallen into the ocean of his own ambition, and his fellow-man's disgust. The more serious problem is not how to gather the men in great numbers, but how to keep them and to save them." (p. 40.)

"Evolution as a substitute for the atonement has wrought untold injury. The atmosphere has been poisoned by this false theology. The press has carried it before the eyes of the men outside of the church, and they have read it and devoured it as a new sensation, but they have failed to digest it, and it has driven them from the church. Many of our best men are away from the church, because their minds have become saturated by this species of infidelity, the most serpentlike and deathly of all its kind. The preacher who has so far forgotten his mission and the meaning of Calvary's blood, as to take the penknife of his own shallow wisdom, and display it defiantly in front of the Holy Spirit of inspiration, while he cuts the sacred page, has unwittingly cut human hearts, and their blood is upon his hands. False doctrine and human substitution are guilty beyond the power of expression, in causing the present condition in church life, and the absence of men from its services. They want the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; and that truth fresh as it came from the hand of God, without one stain of human ignorance in the name of wisdom upon it.

"There is nothing the pew likes better than a positive theology, with its unvarnished application to the common affairs of life. Noth-

ing they care for less than the stilted icicle sentences on Biblical criticism. Let question find its way into the popular mind and heart through some other channel than that of the pulpit. The shocks and sorrows and sins of life must be met, and the Biblical critic stands palsied before them. The old Bible, made to illustrate the life of this generation, will always secure its hearers. It will have no rival in the attractions of the modern Sunday." (pp. 46—48.)

"What the average man wants is a knowledge of the Scriptures, and what they teach concerning Christ and His great salvation. Higher or 'lower' criticism (mostly 'lower') have no satisfaction for his hungering and thirsting soul. Milton said truly, 'The hungry sheep look up and are not fed.' What the inspired Word of God has to say concerning them and their life here, and their hopes hereafter, is of tremendous interest to them. Doubt in the pulpit is always out of place. He who twists the exclamation of the Gospel into a question-mark is a failure. The world has doubts enough of its own. It does not care to breathe that kind of poisoned air from the church. It is faith and confidence and reality and truth which fasten themselves like mighty cords upon the hearts and lives of men. We have weakened our power by our interrogations and our parentheses of skepticism." (pp. 51. f.)

"An unquestioned weakness exists in the poor representation of the principles of Christianity. Men are saying of everything in this day, 'What can it do? Not what is your theory, but what can it do?' That same question is bombarding the church and, alas! alas! breaking down some of its old walls. Many of the leading business as well as professional men of our country are church communicants. A large number of them have separated their own business from the Lord's business by an earthly divorce law, and do not carry their religion into their occupation, and reveal the Christian spirit in everyday life. One of the most pressing needs in the church is seven-day Christianity. Speech is easy, even profession is not difficult; but character is costly, and it is that which is most valuable to the church in reaching the men. The eyes of the world are looking for a difference between the man in the church and the man outside of it. They have a right to find it. The church ought to demand its visible existence. It is a glittering fallacy, but nevertheless a blackhearted one, which declares that we must bring the church into the world and the world into the church in order to reach the unchurched. We have already gone too far in that direction, and have lost power every step of that crooked path. 'Come ye out, and be ye separate,' has never been taken away from the list of divine commands. A separated

church and not a worldly church will accomplish God's desire. Weakness can never become power. Strength of character will alone be the requisite force. We need more church discipline, and not less of it. It is the reasoning of insanity to suppose that men will be drawn to a church which nominally stands for righteousness and yet permits sin and worldliness to control its life." (pp. 60 ff.)

"No human agency can ever supplant the function of the Holy Spirit in the work of reaching men. Methods and agencies may touch the man outwardly, but are thwarted in the most important work. They are only auxiliaries. Philanthropy and education and culture may be accomplished by the merely human element, but the higher and better, and eternal and spiritual impulses depend upon the work of the Holy Spirit; and in ignoring this lies the secret of the failure in many, and apparently earnest, active and attractive churches. It was after the descent of the Holy Spirit in the early church, that the five thousand *men*, besides women, came into its life. The present growth of modern methods in church work, with so much emphasis placed upon their relation to this present life, make more important the deepening of the spiritual life. The extension ought to correspond with the intention. Widening and deepening should be proportionate. If the past preacher and method have been too 'other worldly,' the pendulum should not be allowed to swing too far. All church machinery must be run by the Spirit of God." (pp. 81 f.)

"The man is also influenced by a misunderstanding of the purposes of the church. Its chief object is unknown or ignored by many of its critics. They have failed to recognize its supreme mission as being the mission of its Founder and its Head, 'To seek and to save the lost.' Its business is eternal, and, therefore, unlike any of the world's organizations. It stands unique and alone. It is on earth as the Divine channel for the salvation of the immortal soul from sin and condemnation. It is, therefore, unjust and unreasonable to compare it with any of the world's organizations. They have distinctive and beneficial mission, but it is a wholly temporal one.

"The church is the mightiest factor in human society here and now, but its work has to do first and fundamentally with the needs of the soul. It cares for the body and touches every part of human society, by virtue of the planting of these seeds of eternal life. Its Gospel is deliverance from sin and hell. The man of the world has often misunderstood this important distinction between the church and his lodge or club. He has condemned the church because it did not do just what his organization did, as if they had entered into competition and were supposed to do the same thing, and only that.

The church is not a charitable institution, nor an educational institution, nor a mere center of philanthropy and culture, but it is primarily the place of regeneration and conversion, and eternal salvation. It is the fortification of righteousness in the great battle of sin and wrong. It does the very best for man in this present life, but that is not its controlling motive. The spirit of the Gospel is, 'Peace on earth, good-will to men.' And it has in it the improvement of human society and the making of life more desirable, but that is incidental. It remains true that the purpose of Christ and His coming into the world was to prepare men for the world to come. We confidently assert that the main object of Jesus Christ before the Jewish sanhedrim, and upon the Roman cross, and in His commission of 'go ye,' was to save individuals from future torment. The crucifixion of the Son of God would never have taken place for purely temporal benefit. It is a mockery of His sacrifice, and a sad perversion of truth, to teach that the church ought to have most to do with this life, and the passing necessities of the individual and his society. The emphasis upon the present at the expense of the future, and the emphasis upon the body instead of the soul, have wrought untold injury, and rooted a poisonous misunderstanding in the minds and hearts of men. The church has a social mission, but it has first a saving mission. It is the only power which can save society, but that work can only be accomplished according to the eternal principles of the Gospel.

"We need the practical teaching of the highest morality found in the Ten Commandments, and the Sermon on the Mount, and the Golden Rule; but these very teachings, with all their sublimity and power, are dependent upon truths which some are now casting in the shadow, and yet are so important and so vital to the Gospel and its power, that without them the kingdom of God is an impossibility. We have heard too much in these last days concerning the meat and drink of the kingdom of God." (pp. 97 ff.)

"There is also an elemental fault upon his part, in the standards which he has adopted for judging the church. He passes judgment upon the church because of what an individual in the church may say and do. If one man is bad and ninety-nine others are good, the one man represents the church for him, and he turns his back upon it. This is the common, but radically false, method." (p. 112.)

"The home may be the 'continental divide' in a boy's life. At that point the parents' influence may turn him toward the church or toward the world. Their responsibility is tremendous at that deciding moment. In these days of rush and worldliness, religious teach-

ing and even reading have been banished from most homes. Whatever is done for this part of the child's life has been relegated to the work of the Sunday-school, if it is given any attention whatever. The Sunday-school can never take the place of the home. The teacher can never be to the child what God intended the parent should be. Even the Sunday-school with all of its blessing for our world may not help church attendance, but hinder it, if it stands alone in the child's life. Our great progress in Sunday-school work and the unmistakable tendency to occupy the place of the regular church service among the young, can not be forgotten. No parent who cares for the religious life of his children can afford to allow the Sunday-school to attempt the work which rightfully belongs to the home, or to usurp the place of the church itself. There is no reason why it should." (pp. 124 f.)

"Most of the churchless men have been Sunday-school boys, but did not regularly attend church. As soon as their trousers were lengthened the Sunday-school was too childish for them, and the church service was foreign to their habit of life. To call the Sunday-school the 'children's church' is unjust to the Sunday-school and injurious to the child. This formation of habit in the boy's life is a most potent factor in the problem of churches without men. In addition to this carelessness and species of criminality on the part of parents there is a growing irreverence in the home—the fearless and foolish criticism of things sacred; the frivolous treatment of everything concerning the church. The Bible has not retained its sanctity; even the dust-covered book on the table had more influence than the home without any Bible at all. In some homes nominally Christian it is the custom for those who have attended church to fill the boy's ears with un-Christian criticisms of the service and the sermon. Many a man's whole future relation to the church has been settled at that Sunday dinner table, when the church service was rehearsed and rehashed with shallow fault-finding until it was made positively indigestible. The man now is a moral and spiritual dyspeptic and in the poorest kind of religious health because of that food in his boyhood days. The home created a distaste and dislike for the church. Every element of religion and Godliness and reverence in the home helps to fill the church. If the home loses its religion, the church will lose its men. The church is the salvation of the home, but in one sense the home is the salvation of the church." (pp. 125 ff.)

"Habit and the swing of the whole life over to materialism have rendered the church atmosphere disagreeable and unpleasant to many. An unloosening grip upon the plane and the pen alike has

destroyed all the 'substance' of faith, and created a demand for the things which are seen. This materialistic age, with its mad rush for gold and power, has benumbed religious consciousness. Most men have concentrated their thoughts and desires and activities upon purely temporal acquisition. This is a prolific cause of the evil under discussion. This has robbed men of the time and the inclination for spiritual reflection. This strain upon mind and sensibility has either kept men away from church, or made them dissatisfied with the method of worship. There is a vital relation between this condition and the craze for amusement and entertainment." (pp. 131 f.)

"'Le Grand Prix' is the name given to the great racing day in Paris, which corresponds to Derby Day in England. On that day the most celebrated horses enter the contest; an enormous sum, perhaps a million francs, is distributed in prizes. Like many public festivals in France, it occurs on Sunday. When General Grant was in Paris, he was, of course, the object of universal attention. As a special mark of respect he was invited by the president of the republic to occupy the grand stand. Such an invitation, proceeding from the monarch or chief magistrate, is equivocal to a command, like an invitation to Windsor, or any royal residence; for a person to decline is an unheard-of thing. But General Grant, in a polite note to the president of the republic, said: 'It is not in accordance with the custom of my country, or with the spirit of my religion, to spend Sunday in this way. I therefore beg that you will permit me to decline the honor which you have done me.' And so, when the day came, General Grant was seen quietly sitting among the worshipers in the American Chapel." (pp. 137 f.)

"Our present social system allows the saloon and other kindred evils to do their deadly work in opposition to the interests of the church as well as society itself; and most always to proceed in their diabolism in violation of every law on the statute books. Kegs and demijohns and decanters and hogsheads and glasses and bottles and victims are formed into a wall in front of every church door. This is a fortification of the enemy. It stands in the way of the kingdom of God. Hundreds of thousands of men, the most generous, large-hearted, and many the best of the human family, would be worshipers in the church and servants of the most high God, and marching heavenward, if it were not for this impassable barrier." (p. 139.)

"Business transactions, which would once have received bitterest condemnation, are now passed by without notice. They are declared right simply because of demand and without regard to principle. Policy has come to be the senior partner in the concern. It

is so often repeated with the business man and his employees, and everybody have come to regard it as true, that 'business can not be transacted to-day in strict "honesty,"' — that "'lying" is essential in order to selling.' The church has not yet incorporated this teaching into its morality. It has not made this false principle as an addendum to its Bible. And the world says: 'The church is behind the age.' The church is not at fault here. She can not lower the Divine standards; they are eternal, and as binding upon one age as another. The lines are not drawn distinctly enough. The Bible is explicit in its demands. It reveals the dishonest man, and the small and large gambler, whether in stocks or dice, and places the mark upon falsehood everywhere. The church, with a conscience and a Bible, and a tremendous responsibility, can not cater to the demands or methods of this day. Society has no right to say 'old-fashioned' to the church. The church has the right and duty to say 'condemned to society.' (pp. 140 ff.)

While we fully endorse what is well and truly said in these extracts, we can not side with the author in statements like these:—

"There is another evil related to this one, or rather an expansion of it, in the lack of the brotherly relation, and of co-operation of the various churches. The world is not schooled in doctrinal distinctions, and can not easily recognize the necessity for church separation, and sometimes church opposition. No period in the world's history has witnessed more significant changes than this age in which we live. The tendency of the time in the political and business world alike is unquestionably toward consolidation and centralization and co-operation. The man who fails to recognize this, fails in his undertaking. The church which fails to adopt itself to this characteristic of the age, must also fail to reach the men of this age. Co-operation must be one of the watchwords of the church in the dawning hour of the twentieth century. Organizations have been multiplied, and even different denominations separated into more divisions, and religious efforts have been scattered and weakened, and fields have been neglected while others have been crowded, and no great and united effort has been made toward co-operation in spending money and utilizing effort to reach men. Denominations with vital principles should live, and can live, even if we destroy sectarianism and bigotry." /

"What defeat we would have experienced if our battle-ships in the Pacific, or in the Atlantic, had turned their guns upon each other

instead of the enemy. The church has been guilty of this weakness and folly, but is opening its eyes to-day toward the enemy and the necessity of co-operation.

"At the charge of Ft. Donaldson, in the late war, the enemy's works had been attacked many times by the different companies. At last, wearied of their fruitless efforts, the Union forces for the most part massed themselves at the foot of the hill, and advanced together. They came on in such numbers, and with unbroken lines, that nothing could withstand their progress. They gained the heights, and, united, won a victory which their divided forces could never have obtained.

"Division has driven men away from the church, and wherever it exists to-day it breeds disgust. People are afraid of a riot, and they will go around an entire block to get out of its way. The church must understand that principle. The necessity is for a growing recognition of the good in all denominations, and that which is fundamental in doctrines and life, and which is common to all. There is a basis in our Christianity upon which we all can work. There is a center around which we all can move. The cross is the important point, and all emphasis can be safely and harmoniously given to that. Our real force in church aggressiveness to-day is largely denominational rather than Christian. Organizations are multiplied on some fields, while time and money are wasted, and men are not reached. All denominations should get together as business concerns, and in the spirit of the age map out the work and utilize the force. That may be an ideal of the future, but it should be the goal toward which every conscientious, consecrated, earnest Christian man and church is striving. Men are drawn toward great institutions and great enterprises. We need great centers of life and activity, and at least in village and city alike there should be co-operation and the concentration of effort in the accomplishment of the one supreme purpose." (pp. 76 ff.)

We are so far from endorsing this, that we rather deem the spirit which prompts these utterances one of the fundamental evils which work together for evil in the religious life of the present time. It is the spirit of syncretism, which looks upon diversity of doctrine as no sufficient bar to ecclesiastical co-operation and fraternal fellowship in religious endeavors. A man who is not fully persuaded that the doctrine preached in his church is in all its points God's truth, and

that all doctrines at variance therewith are *pro tanto* false, lacks the very first and chief principle on which the duty of regular attendance upon public worship is and should be based, and the ruling motive by which the conscientious performance of such duty should be prompted. Ours is eminently an age of syncretistic indifference, and if or as far as it is true that men, when they go to church, want the truth, and the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, it is but consistent that they should stay away from a church in which preachers and congregations fellowship with those whose doctrine is at variance with their own. Syncretism was at all times the precursor and concomitant of rationalism, and a natural fruit of either or of both is the depletion of the churches. Interdenominational co-operation is consistently possible only in consequence of a disregard or at a sacrifice not only of certain particular truths, but of the very concept of *truth*, especially of *divine truth*, and, hence, cannot work as a stimulus to, but must and actually does work as a mildew on the desire and practice of hearing what a preacher might have to say whose first and foremost duty it should be to inculcate the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. False doctrine is sin, most grievous sin, more heinous than murder and adultery, and the man who would fellowship and co-operate with adulterers and harlots would probably find few attendants upon his lectures on the sanctity of marriage and the beauties of chastity.

Another drain upon the churches which has estranged thousands of men from public worship is touched upon by our author as follows:—

"Keep first things first. The lodge has its place, and a place of benefit in society, but woe be to the man who allows it to usurp the place of the church, or compares the one with the other. They are not upon the same level, because they have not the same purpose and never can have. The open Bible on the altar of a lodge room can never take the place of the pulpit, which stands in the shadow of the cross, and from which is constantly heard, 'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.' Christ came to

teach men how to live in relation with each other, but He came first to teach them how to live in right relation with God. The kingdom of God comes here and now, just in proportion as that elemental truth is understood and propagated. Any competition with anything else in the world is sin. The church stands alone or can not stand at all. Its very life and victory depend upon its holding that distinct position in the world. It is the voice of the unreasonable as well as the unrighteous which says, 'the lodge is my church.''" (pp. 101. 102.)

This is something of a testimony against the evil of Masonry and other secret societies; but it is far from being what it should be. The lodge has its place, but not a place of benefit in society. It is an evil from beginning to end, and has its place among other evils which are sapping away the life of the church and gnawing at the roots of domestic happiness and the welfare of the nation. The open Bible on the altar of a lodge room is a mockery and a blasphemy, and to say that it can never take the place of the pulpit is in fact disparaging to the pulpit, very much as it would be disparaging married life to say that the bawdy-house can never take the place of the family home. The religion of the lodge is idolatry, and the tendency to supplant the church is not only incidental but natural and essential to all lodges with any manner or measure of so-called religious exercises. A church which admits that "the lodge has its place" and permits its men to be in that place has to that extent waived its claim upon those men as regular attendants at its services. It is just as inconsistent for a Free-Mason to join in the religious exercises of a Christian congregation as it is for a member of a Christian church to join in the idolatrous exercises of a masonic lodge. If it is proper to ask, "What concord hath Christ with Belial?" it is just as proper to ask, "What concord hath Belial with Christ?" In order to bar the lodge from depleting the church, it will not do to say, "Keep first things first," but it is necessary to keep the men of the church out of the lodge and the men of the lodge out of the church.

A. G.

Ronayne's Reminiscences. *A history of his life and renunciation of Romanism and Freemasonry.* By E. Ronayne, Past Master of Keystone Lodge No. 639, A. F. & A. M. Chicago, Ill. Free Methodist Publication House. Chicago, Ill. 1900. IX and 445 pages. Bound in cloth; price, \$1.00.

The author and subject of this autobiography was known throughout the country for many years before he wrote the story of his life, having been in his day the aim of innumerable rotten eggs and other missiles, liquid, semiliquid, and solid, thrown by infuriated members or partisans of secret societies at a man who had himself been prominent in lodge circles but had turned against Free-masonry and exposed the workings of the lodge in lectures and demonstrations and printed publications. His description and narrative of his early life in the Roman Catholic church in his native country, Ireland, his liberation from the bonds of Romanism, his experiences as a member of secret societies in Canada and the United States, and his subsequent conflicts with Masons and Masonry, is highly interesting and instructive reading. On the other hand, Mr. Ronayne's knowledge of Christian doctrine, as exhibited in his book, is extremely scanty, and the little he has acquired is mostly of very inferior quality. This serious defect bars the work from a general recommendation, which it would otherwise deserve.

A. G.

The real presence, or, why do I believe the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's supper? By William Dallmann. Pittsburg, Pa. American Lutheran Publication Board. 1900. 44 Pages; paper cover; price, 10 cents.

The reverend author of this pamphlet presents a clear and concise statement of the Lutheran doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Lord's Supper,

and the cogent reasons for its acceptance. Besides these, he also points out several considerations which are not in themselves stringent arguments for the acceptance of this doctrine as an article of faith, but tend to corroborate the direct evidence of the Scriptures. The familiar objections are pithily dealt with, and the whole treatise is such that deserves a wide circulation.

A. G.

The Trial of Jesus Christ. *A legal monograph by A. Taylor Innes, Advocate. Edinburgh. T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street. 1899. 123 pages; bound in cloth; price, \$1.00.*

This is not a theological work. The author has treated his subject very much as he might have treated the trial of Mary Stuart, that of Charles I, or that of Louis XVI, as a judicial process which resulted in the execution of a capital sentence. Yet, while the central event in history is here considered in its forensic aspect only, the theologian, who looks upon this event in its soteriological aspect, may derive more real profit from this "legal monograph" than from many treatises of so-called theologians who by their untheological and unhistorical methods have criticised away the very foundation on which the subject can be treated in any aspect at all. As a lawyer, our author knows that every legal investigation has to deal with two distinct sets of questions, questions of *fact*, and questions of *law*, and though he nowhere expressly makes this distinction, his work clearly shows that he has had his eye on these two sets of questions. For the points of fact in the case he simply relies on the gospel narratives as he finds them in our New Testament, and the points of law he collects from his knowledge of Jewish and Roman jurisprudence obtained from various sources. Thus, while he maintains his legal point of view throughout, he deals with matters concerning which the theologian, too, should be most thoroughly informed in every respect, the

forensic view not excepted. We have heard and seen erroneous statements in lenten sermons due to a lack of thorough information on this most momentous capital trial of all history. And here we must say that the monograph before us also fails to satisfy us because of a lack of thoroughness. There was in Roman law such a thing as trial by jury, and it was extensively practiced, even in criminal procedure, also under the emperors, the jurors returning their verdict by a majority of ballots marked A.¹⁾ or C.²⁾ or N. L.³⁾ There were attorneys pleading for the prosecution and for the defense in Roman trials. Why not in the trial of Jesus? There were two distinct kinds of procedure, *judicia* and *cognitiones*, a distinction nowhere mentioned in this book, but of great importance for a correct estimate of the trial of Jesus in its legal aspect. There were remarkable similarities between the trial of Jesus and the trials of Christians before imperial magistrates. What were they? Perhaps we may find an opportunity to enter upon these points at greater length than our limited space will at present permit. Meanwhile Mr. Innes' book is cordially recommended to our readers.

A. G.

1) Absolvo.

2) Condemno.

3) Non liquet.